

# Indirect Inference With(Out) Constraints

David T. Frazier\* and Eric Renault<sup>†</sup>

August 31, 2016

## Abstract

Indirect Inference (I-I) estimation of structural parameters  $\theta$  requires matching observed and simulated auxiliary statistics, which are consistent estimators of instrumental parameters  $\beta$  and whose value depends on the value of  $\theta$  through a binding function. The instrumental parameters encapsulate the statistical information used for inference about the structural parameters, and, as such, constraining these parameters may restrict the information available for inference on  $\theta$ , possibly leading to a decrease in efficiency. However, in certain situations the parameters  $\beta$  naturally come with a set of  $q$  restrictions. Examples include (1), settings where  $\beta$  must be estimated subject to  $q$  possibly binding strict inequality constraints  $g(\cdot) > 0$  (see, e.g., stochastic volatility models in Calzolari, Fiorentini and Sentana, 2004); (2), cases where the auxiliary model is obtained by imposing  $q$  equality constraints  $g(\theta) = 0$  on the structural model to define computationally simple estimates of  $\beta$  that are seen as approximations of  $\theta$ , since the simplifying constraints are misspecified (see, e.g., asset pricing models in Calvet and Czellar, 2015); (3), examples where  $\beta$  is defined by  $q$  estimating equations that overidentify them. In these settings, i.e., (1)-(3), we propose a novel and efficient I-I approach that disregards the constrained auxiliary statistics, and instead performs I-I using appropriately modified unconstrained auxiliary statistics, which are simple to compute and always exists. We state the relevant asymptotic theory for this I-I approach without constraints in each of these three non-standard circumstances and show that it can be reinterpreted as a standard implementation of I-I through a properly modified binding function.

*Keywords:* Inequality Restrictions; Constrained Estimation; Parameters on the Boundary; Indirect Inference; Stochastic Volatility; Asset Pricing.

---

\*Department of Econometrics and Business Statistics, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Economics, Brown University, and Department of Econometrics and Business Statistics, Monash University.

<sup>‡</sup>We thank Geert Dhaene, Philipp Ketz, and Mervyn Silvapulle for helpful comments and discussions.

# 1 Introduction

The indirect estimation procedures of Gourieroux, Monfort and Renault (1993) (hereafter, GMR), Smith (1993) and Gallant and Tauchen (1996) (hereafter, GT) provide convenient estimation methods when efficient estimation of a fully parametric structural model is a daunting task due to the intractability of the likelihood function. GMR motivate Indirect Inference (I-I) by arguing that in such cases a natural procedure is to replace the likelihood function by another criterion based on some convenient auxiliary (or naive) model that is simpler but possibly misspecified. The overall aim of I-I is then to conduct correct inference “based on this incorrect criterion.”

As described by Jiang and Turnbull (2004), the “essential ingredients” of I-I are as follows:

- (i) A parametric model for data generation, with distribution  $P_\theta$  that depends on an unknown vector  $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$  of parameters of interest. This model is the so-called structural model and  $\theta$  is the vector of structural parameters.
- (ii) One first computes an intermediate or auxiliary statistic  $\hat{\beta}_T$  of dimension  $d_\beta \geq d_\theta$ , which is a functional of the observed sample  $\{y_t\}_{t=1}^T$ .
- (iii) A bridge (or binding) relationship  $\beta = b(\theta)$  is defined between the true unknown value  $\theta^0$  of the structural parameters and  $\beta^0 = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_T$ . The unknown quantity  $\beta^0 = b(\theta^0)$  is called the true unknown value of the auxiliary parameters.
- (iv) With the auxiliary estimate  $\hat{\beta}_T$  replacing  $\beta$ , the bridge relationship above is used to compute an I-I estimator of  $\theta$  by “inverting”  $b(\theta)$ .

Jiang and Turnbull (2004) acknowledge that “the choice of an intermediate statistic  $\hat{\beta}_T$  is not necessarily unique; however, in any given situation there is often a natural one to use.” Herein, we question this traditional interpretation of I-I as it pertains to examples where the concept of a “binding function” is ambiguous. Such settings are exemplified by the following three examples: one, settings where the constrained estimator of  $\beta$  is consistent but not asymptotically normal (inequality constraints); two, situations where we have lost the ability to identify  $\theta^0$  from the binding function due to certain of its component being fixed by some equality restrictions; three, settings where, due to overidentification of  $\beta$ , several different binding functions are available with different implications for the asymptotic accuracy of the I-I estimator of  $\theta$ . We stress that the focus of interest in I-I is the true unknown value of  $\theta$ , denoted by  $\theta^0$ , and that even for a well-defined value of  $\beta^0$ , there may exist a plethora of possible binding functions  $b(\cdot)$  such that  $\beta^0 = b(\theta^0)$ . In these settings, we will demonstrate that one should not necessarily fish for our preferred estimator of  $\beta$  (the so-called “intermediate or auxiliary statistic  $\hat{\beta}_T$ ”) but for our preferred binding function  $b(\cdot)$  as it pertains to estimation of  $\theta^0$ . We now briefly elaborate on each of the three cases discussed above.

Our first case of interest concerns situations where the definition of the parameter set for the auxiliary model entails some inequality restrictions. As noted by Calzolari, Fiorentini and Sentana (2004) (hereafter, CFS), the pseudo-likelihood function of the auxiliary model may not be well-defined when certain parameter restrictions are violated. CFS have rightly pointed out that, among the assumptions that GMR need to maintain for their asymptotic theory, one of the conditions “is that the parameters of the auxiliary model are unrestricted, and consequently, that their pseudo-maximum likelihood estimators (PML) have an asymptotically normal distribution.” Pseudo-likelihood maximization subject to inequality restriction may lead to an “intermediate statistic”  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$  that is not well-suited for I-I because it is not asymptotically normal.

Given that the auxiliary model used for I-I may only be an approximation of the structural

model, the efficiency loss of I-I, with respect to maximum likelihood estimation (MLE), is tightly related to the inability of the auxiliary model to nest the structural model. Therefore, it seems paradoxical to constrain the auxiliary model to be an even cruder approximation of the true model. The first contribution of this paper is to revisit CFS by considering cases where a constrained auxiliary model may be a sensible object, in spite of the above paradox. In the case of inequality constraints, the fact that, as mentioned by CFS, PML may not have an asymptotic normal distribution must come from the fact that the true unknown value of the auxiliary parameters, i.e., the probability limit of the (constrained) PML sequence, is either on the boundary or near the boundary of the parameter space (see, e.g., Andrews, 1999, 2002, and Ketz, 2016). We make this intuition formal by considering a drifting data generating process (DGP) such that, for any finite sample size, the population parameter  $\beta_T^0$  belongs to the interior of the parameter space, even though its limit value  $\beta^0$  may be on the boundary, invalidating the standard Gaussian asymptotic theory.

This framework allows us to revisit the results of CFS in the case where the pseudo-likelihood function of the auxiliary model is not well-defined when certain parameter restrictions are violated, and in particular to give a more formal treatment of their illustrative example of a stochastic volatility model estimated via a GARCH(1,1) auxiliary model. In particular, we show that the linear combinations of initial auxiliary parameters and Kuhn-Tucker multipliers that CFS put forward as new “auxiliary parameters” for the purpose of I-I, based on constrained PML, can always be interpreted as the components of a variant of unconstrained PML. In this respect, we are back to the above claim that I-I should be performed without constraints on the parameter space of the auxiliary model, in spite of seemingly constrained PML estimation.

The second case of interest concerns the relevance of equality constraints. CFS note that “in many situations of empirical interest, it is considerably simpler to estimate a special restrictive case of the auxiliary model than to maximize the unrestricted log-likelihood function.” Again, a restricted version of the auxiliary model, as opposed to a supposedly “unrestricted log-likelihood function,” sounds like an oxymoron. The auxiliary model is not a structural one and thus there is no such thing as a well-specified but complicated auxiliary model as opposed to a simpler but misspecified version. In any case, the supposedly “unrestricted log-likelihood function” is nothing but a pseudo-likelihood that should have been chosen precisely for its user friendly features. If you do not like the auxiliary model, just change it!

However, we follow this train of thinking, but with the following twist. It is the structural model that is too complicated and the auxiliary model is built as a simplified version of the structural model that we obtain by imposing some equality constraints. This strategy has recently been put forward by Calvet and Czellar (2015) in the context of structural macro-finance models. We concur with the authors and consider that “since the auxiliary and structural models are then closely related, the resulting I-I estimator is expected to have good accuracy properties.” Unfortunately, practical implementation of this strategy may be problematic since by definition, when auxiliary parameters are defined as an equality-constrained version of the structural parameters, the former are not sufficient to identify the latter (except if by chance it makes sense to assume that these constraints are fulfilled by the structural parameters). The applied researcher is then left alone to fish for additional estimating equations to identify the structural parameters. Using the constrained I-I theory developed herein, and in CFS, we propose a novel, automatic way to ensure identification of the structural parameters for the purpose of I-I from the score vector of the structural model, while otherwise, following Calvet and Czellar (2015), one must resort to a set of *ad hoc* moments whose informativeness is not

guaranteed.

Moreover, while the constrained inference approach of CFS needs to maintain a high-level identification assumption when the vector of auxiliary parameters is augmented by the Lagrange multipliers, in this setting our approach allows us to revisit the required identification assumption in a more primitive manner. In particular, we show that this assumption is always fulfilled when the structural model is defined from an exponential family of probability distributions (see, e.g., Gourieroux and Monfort, 1995). Note that, if by chance, the constraints are fulfilled by the true unknown value of the structural parameters, we are back to constrained estimation as efficient as constrained MLE.

The third case of interest is when the auxiliary parameters  $\beta$ , instead of being based on a just identified set of PML first-order conditions, are defined from an overidentified set of estimating equations, either based on minimum distance estimation, as dubbed, “Asymptotic Least Squares” (ALS) by Gourieroux, Monfort and Trognon (1985) as well as Gourieroux and Monfort (1995) (a set of  $q$  equations,  $g(\varsigma, \beta) = 0$ ,  $q > d_\beta$ , when a consistent estimator  $\hat{\varsigma}_T$  of the nuisance parameters  $\varsigma$  is available) or based on the Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) of Hansen (1982) (a set of  $q$  moment conditions,  $E[\varphi(y_t, \beta)] = 0$ ,  $q > d_\beta$ ). Note that this non-standard context of I-I is more frequent than it looks. For instance, the approach of I-I promoted by GT is through the use of a score generator based on a Semi-Non-Parametric (SNP) auxiliary model. While the number of parameters of such a model may in principle be arbitrarily large, practical applications will often lead researchers to doubt that all auxiliary parameters are really needed; for instance, perhaps because pretests of model specification do not reject some hypotheses like constant conditional kurtosis, and/or zero leverage effect, etc. In other words, one may be tempted to reduce the set of moments to match since some auxiliary parameters may seem uninformative. Here again, we show that I-I estimation of the structural parameters should not be conducted with any constraints on the auxiliary statistics. In particular, we demonstrate that the classical formulas for optimal selection of estimating equations in efficient ALS or GMM estimation must be drastically modified when the focus of interest is indirect estimation of  $\theta$  and not direct estimation of  $\beta$ .

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section two, we revisit the results of CFS and, through a simple illustrative example, make rigorous the notion of auxiliary parameters ‘near the boundary’ using a drifting sequence of pseudo-true values that satisfy the constraints. In this section and the following, we explicitly work under the null-hypothesis that the inequality constraints imposed on the auxiliary criterion function are valid, and argue that only in this context does the concept of a drifting DGP remain useful. Within this particular setup, we demonstrate that a well-defined unconstrained auxiliary parameter estimator, carrying the same amount of information as the “well-behaved” linear combinations of restricted auxiliary estimates and Kuhn-Tucker multipliers used in CFS to identify the structural parameters, always exists and can be readily used for the purpose of I-I. Section three uses this unconstrained auxiliary estimator to propose a novel score-based I-I estimator, in the spirit of GT, and compares this approach with the score-based I-I approach proposed in CFS. In this section we also demonstrate that the ‘restricted’ Wald-based I-I approach put forward in CFS can be reinterpreted as an ‘unrestricted’ Wald-based I-I approach using the results of Section two. A series of Monte Carlo examples in Section four demonstrate the good performance of this approach. In Section five, we consider the case where equality constraints are imposed on a structural model for the purpose of defining a computationally friendly auxiliary criterion. Such an approach to I-I, as recently applied by Calvet and Czellar (2015), seems to require the use of *ad hoc* moments

besides the constrained score in order to guarantee identification. In contrast, we demonstrate that our proposed I-I approach to constrained inference yields an automatic way to complete the score-based estimating equations to ensure identification and accurate estimation of the structural parameters. As an illustrative example, we demonstrate that this new I-I approach will yield computationally simple parameter estimates in a dynamic probit model with serial correlation. Section six considers efficient I-I estimation when the auxiliary parameters are defined either through an overidentified minimum distance ALS or GMM approach, and discusses the implications for efficient I-I estimation of  $\theta$ . Section seven concludes. All proofs are relegated to the appendix.

## 2 Inequality Constraints on the Auxiliary Model

### 2.1 An Illustrative Example

We consider the same illustrative example as in Section three of CFS, namely, I-I on a log-normal stochastic volatility (SV) model using a GARCH(1,1) auxiliary model with Gaussian or Student-t innovations. The log-normal stochastic volatility model is defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} y_t &= \sqrt{h_t} e_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, T \\ \ln(h_t) &= \alpha + \delta \ln(h_{t-1}) + \sigma_v v_t \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $|\delta| < 1$ ,  $\sigma_v > 0$ ,  $(e_t, v_t)' \sim_{i.i.d.} N(0, \text{Id}_2)$  and we denote the structural parameters as  $\theta = (\alpha, \delta, \sigma_v)'$ . We observe a series  $\{y_t\}_{t=1}^T$  from the SV model in (1) and our goal is to conduct inference on  $\theta$ . For a general discussion of both continuous and discrete-time SV models see the review article by Ghysels et al. (1996).

It is well-known that a closed-form expression for the log-likelihood of the SV model is generally not available. Therefore, many simulation and filtering estimation procedures have been applied to estimate  $\theta$ . In this way, the SV model has become the benchmark model for analyzing the finite-sample properties of I-I and other simulation based estimation procedures; in an I-I context, see, e.g., Engle and Lee (1996), Monfardini (1998), Pastorello et al. (2000) and CFS.

We follow CFS and consider as our auxiliary model for I-I the GARCH(1,1) model

$$\begin{aligned} y_t &= \sqrt{h_t} \epsilon_t \\ h_t &= \psi + \varphi y_{t-1}^2 + \pi h_{t-1} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Common specifications for the errors  $\epsilon_t$  in (2) are  $\epsilon_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \sim N(0, 1)$  and  $\epsilon_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$  Student-t with  $1/\eta$  degrees of freedom, where  $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$  represents all information known at time  $t - 1$ . In either case, the auxiliary parameters will be denoted as  $\beta$ , with  $\beta = (\psi, \varphi, \pi)'$  if  $\epsilon_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \sim N(0, 1)$  and  $\beta = (\psi, \varphi, \pi, \eta)'$  otherwise. The GARCH(1,1) model is very useful as an auxiliary model as it can capture many of the structural ideas associated with (1), such as thick tails and volatility clustering, while yielding closed form formulas for the score and Hessian based on the pseudo-log-likelihood  $Q_T(\beta)$ . Indeed, Kim et al. (1998) conduct a formal analysis comparing the log-normal SV model in (1) and the GARCH(1,1) model with Student-t errors, and demonstrate that both models often display similar fit.

The GARCH(1,1) auxiliary model is generally estimated subject to inequality constraints that ensure the pseudo-log-likelihood  $Q_T(\beta)$  is well-behaved. The set of constraints for the auxiliary model can be stated as

$$\psi \geq 0, \varphi > 0, \pi \geq 0, \varphi + \pi \leq 1 \quad (3)$$

with the added constraint  $0 \leq \eta < .5$  when  $\epsilon_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$  is distributed as Student-t with  $1/\eta$  degrees of freedom. To enforce the above strict inequalities on auxiliary parameters, CFS require (see their footnote five on page 960) that the GARCH parameters in their auxiliary model satisfy

$$\varphi \geq 0.025, \eta \leq 0.499 \quad (4)$$

To provide theoretical underpinnings for this common practice in econometrics, we will assume that we have a drifting Data Generating Process (DGP), with a possibly sample size dependent value  $\beta_T = (\psi_T, \varphi_T, \pi_T, \eta_T)'$  for the auxiliary parameters, which satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_T &\geq \bar{\varphi}_T, \quad 0 < \bar{\varphi}_T, \quad \bar{\varphi}_T = o(1) \\ 0 &\leq \eta_T \leq \bar{\eta}_T, \quad 0 < 0.5 - \bar{\eta}_T = o(1), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

with  $o(1)$  a deterministic sequence converging to zero as the sample size  $T$  goes to infinity. The next subsection builds and elaborates on the above framework to accommodate a drifting unknown true value of the auxiliary parameters that may be near the boundary of the parameter space where the auxiliary criterion  $Q_T(\beta)$  and its derivatives remain well-defined.

## 2.2 Assumptions for Parameters Near the Boundary

We are interested in estimating the population value  $\beta^0$  of a vector  $\beta \in \mathbf{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\beta}$  of auxiliary parameters. In order to capture the case of extremum estimation when  $\beta^0$  is on the boundary (or near the boundary), our sample-dependent objective function  $\beta \rightarrow Q_T(\beta)$  is defined only on a compact subset of  $\mathbf{B}$  that may depend on  $T$  and is restricted by a vector of inequality constraints.

Denote by  $\mathbf{B}_T$  an increasing sequence  $\mathbf{B}_T \subseteq \mathbf{B}_{T+1}, T = 1, 2, \dots$ , of compact subsets of  $\mathbf{B}$  such that:

$$\mathbf{B} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \nearrow \mathbf{B}_T = \bigcup_{T \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbf{B}_T$$

and let  $g : \mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ , with  $q < d_\beta$ , be a known function that is continuously differentiable on the interior set,  $\text{Int}(\mathbf{B})$ , of  $\mathbf{B}$ . The sample-dependent objective function  $\beta \rightarrow Q_T(\beta)$  is then defined on the compact subset  $\mathbf{B}_T^r$  of  $\mathbf{B}_T$  where inequality constraints defined by  $g(\cdot)$  are fulfilled:

$$\mathbf{B}_T^r = \{\beta \in \mathbf{B}_T : g(\beta) \geq a_T\}$$

where  $g(\beta) \geq a_T$  is taken to mean that each component  $g_j(\cdot)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, q$ , of  $g(\cdot)$  is larger than or equal to the corresponding component  $a_{j,T}$  of  $a_T$ . Note that our setting can accommodate equality constraints  $g_j(\beta) = 0$  by choosing, for instance,  $g_{j+1}(\cdot) = -g_j(\cdot)$  where  $a_{j+1,T} = a_{j,T} = 0$  for all  $T \geq 1$ . More generally, we will assume  $a_T = o(1)$ .

As an illustration, for the example in Section 2.1, one may consider  $\mathbf{B}_T$  as the sequence of compact sets:

$$\mathbf{B}_T = \{(\psi, \varphi, \pi, \eta)' : T \geq \psi \geq 0, \varphi \geq 0, \pi \geq 0, \varphi + \pi \leq 1, 0 \leq \eta \leq 0.5\}$$

The restricted set  $\mathbf{B}_T^r$  is then defined by the constraints

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(\beta) &= \varphi, \quad a_{1,T} = \bar{\varphi}_T > 0 \\ g_2(\beta) &= 0.5 - \eta, \quad a_{2,T} = 0.5 - \bar{\eta}_T > 0 \end{aligned}$$

We have in mind a drifting DGP, such that the true unknown value  $\beta_T^0$  of the parameters is asymptotically defined by the maximization of the objective function  $Q_T(\cdot)$  on  $\mathbf{B}_T^r$ . More precisely, if  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$  stands for the constrained estimator

$$\hat{\beta}_T^r = \arg \max_{\beta \in \mathbf{B}_T^r} Q_T(\beta)$$

we assume the existence of a non-stochastic sequence  $\beta_T^0$  such that

$$\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \beta_T^0 - \hat{\beta}_T^r \right\} = 0$$

Our reasoning for considering a drifting DGP is that we want to ensure that the drifting true unknown value  $\beta_T^0$  belongs to the interior of the parameter set

$$\beta_T^0 \in \text{Int}(\mathbf{B}_T) \cap \mathbf{B}_T^r$$

When the asymptotic value  $\beta^0 = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \beta_T^0$  is on the boundary of the parameter set  $\mathbf{B}$ , we will say that the true value is “near the boundary.” On the contrary, when  $\beta^0$  is in the interior of the parameter set, this drifting DGP concept is hardly useful; one can then assume  $\beta_T^0 = \beta^0$  for all  $T$  sufficiently large. For instance, in the illustrative example above, we do not need to impose a drifting true value for  $\psi^0$ ; when  $\varphi^0$  is on the boundary ( $\varphi^0 = 0$ ),  $\psi^0$  must be strictly positive and its constrained estimator (the sample mean of  $y_t^2$ ) will automatically fulfill this inequality constraint.

It is worth noting that we maintain the assumption that the drifting true value  $\beta_T^0$  always fulfills the constraints. In particular, by continuity, the population true value  $\beta^0$  fulfills the equality constraints while it may be on the boundary for the inequality constraints, and thus violating the strict inequality constraints we implicitly want to maintain (see the illustrative example above). However, we may expect that all Kuhn Tucker multipliers still converge to zero, in contrast to the setting considered in the asymptotic theory of CFS. This drifting DGP setting, albeit absent in CFS, is required to rigorously accommodate the illustrative example in CFS and in Subsection 2.1. It is only in the case of equality constraints, without need of a drifting DGP, that non-zero population Lagrange multipliers will be worth considering; see Section five for more details.

A couple of remarks are in order to compare our setup with the extant literature on estimation with a parameter on the boundary. First, since  $\beta_T^0$  is assumed to fulfill the inequality constraints, it may be on the boundary of the set  $\mathbf{B}_T^r$  defined by these constraints. Second, we assume that  $\beta_T^0$  is in the interior of  $\mathbf{B}_T$  to be sure that  $Q_T(\beta)$  and its derivatives are well-defined at  $\beta = \beta_T^0$ . In particular, we have in mind cases when  $\beta$  must fulfill some strict inequalities for  $Q_T(\beta)$  to be well-defined. For example, in the illustrative example above, CFS require some parameters in their auxiliary model to be strictly positive to ensure that  $Q_T(\beta)$  is well-defined, which they enforce by maintaining (4) while we enforce this condition by maintaining (5).

More precisely, it may be that  $\beta_T^0$  converges toward some  $\beta^0$  on the boundary, but at a rate sufficiently slow to avoid modifying the standard asymptotic theory due to this second boundary

problem (beyond the first one created by some binding constraints  $g_j(\cdot)$ ,  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$ ). To do so, we impose the following assumption.

**Assumption A0:** For some  $\delta < 1/2$  :

$$\left\{ \beta \in \mathbf{B}; \|\beta - \beta_T^0\| < \frac{1}{T^\delta} \right\} \subset \text{Int}(\mathbf{B}_T) \quad (6)$$

and  $\beta^0 = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \beta_T^0$  exists.

**Assumption A0** effectively ensures that a root- $T$  consistent estimator  $\bar{\beta}_T$  of  $\beta_T^0$ , in the sense that  $\sqrt{T}(\bar{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0) = O_P(1)$ , will be in the interior of  $\mathbf{B}_T$  for  $T$  sufficiently large.

We maintain the same assumptions on the asymptotic behavior of  $Q_T(\beta)$  as CFS (see their Assumptions 1 and 3), but adapt their assumptions to accommodate a possibly drifting DGP.

**Assumption A1:** The function  $\beta \rightarrow Q_T(\beta)$  is twice continuously differentiable on  $\text{Int}(\mathbf{B}_T) \cap \mathbf{B}_T^r$  and the following are satisfied:

(i)  $\sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} \rightarrow_d \aleph(0, \mathcal{I}^0)$ .

(ii) For any  $\beta_T^*$  satisfying  $\beta_T^* - \beta^0 = O_P(1/\sqrt{T})$ ,  $\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\beta_T^*)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} = -\mathcal{J}^0$ , where  $\mathcal{I}^0$  and  $\mathcal{J}^0$  are non-stochastic  $(d_\beta \times d_\beta)$  positive definite matrices.

## 2.3 Asymptotic Theory for the Constrained Auxiliary Model

We now consider the constrained estimation problem for the auxiliary model

$$\hat{\beta}_T^r = \arg \max_{\beta \in \mathbf{B}_T^r} Q_T(\beta)$$

which we solve through the Lagrangian function

$$\mathcal{L}_T(\beta, \lambda) = Q_T(\beta) + (g(\beta) - a_T)' \lambda$$

Since the (drifting) true value and a well suited ball around it (see (6)) is included in the interior of the parameter set  $\mathbf{B}_T$ , the only constraint to enforce via Kuhn-Tucker (hereafter, KT) multipliers are, for  $T$  sufficiently large, the constraints about the non-negativity of the components of  $g(\cdot)$ . The rationale is that under standard regularity conditions (see next subsection), the constrained estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$  will be root- $T$  consistent towards the drifting true value  $\beta_T^0$  and thus will itself belong (for  $T$  sufficiently large and with probability arbitrarily close to one) to the ball (6) around  $\beta_T^0$ , and ultimately to the interior of  $\mathbf{B}_T$ . Therefore, the constrained estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$  and associated KT multipliers  $\hat{\lambda}_T$  are defined as solutions of the first-order conditions

$$\frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial g'(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \cdot \hat{\lambda}_T = 0 \quad (7)$$

with the slackness conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\lambda}_{j,T} \cdot (g_j(\hat{\beta}_T^r) - a_{j,T}) &= 0, \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, q \\ g(\hat{\beta}_T^r) &\geq a_T, \hat{\lambda}_T \geq 0, a_T = o(1) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

CFS rightly stress that these conditions may produce some singularity (and non-normality) in the asymptotic distribution of the constrained estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$  so that it cannot be used directly for the purpose of I-I based on an asymptotic normal estimator (with a non-singular asymptotic covariance matrix) of  $\beta$ . For this reason, CFS fish for a seemingly ad hoc linear combination of the constrained estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$  and the vector  $\hat{\lambda}_T$  of KT multipliers that is asymptotically normal (see Proposition 2 in CFS, page 950). Our first key result is to show that this linear combination is actually tightly related to the (potentially) infeasible unconstrained estimator.

**Proposition 1:** For  $T$  sufficiently large, with probability arbitrarily close to one,

$$J_T \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0 \right) - \frac{\partial g'(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} \sqrt{T} \hat{\lambda}_T = J_T \sqrt{T} \left( \check{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0 \right) + o_P(1), \quad (9)$$

where  $J_T = -\frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'}$  and  $\check{\beta}_T$  is the consistent asymptotically normal infeasible unconstrained estimator of  $\beta_T^0$  defined as

$$\sqrt{T} \left( \check{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0 \right) = J_T^{-1} \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} \rightarrow_d \aleph \left( 0, [\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1} \mathcal{I}^0 [\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1} \right) \quad (10)$$

Moreover, the remainder term  $o_P(1)$  in (9) is identically zero when the criterion function  $Q_T(\beta)$  is quadratic and the constraints  $g(\beta)$  are linear.  $\square$

$\check{\beta}_T$  is dubbed the “infeasible unconstrained estimator” of  $\beta$  since the naive unconstrained estimator over  $\mathbf{B}$  (will) may not exist if  $Q_T(\beta)$  is not defined outside  $\mathbf{B}_T^r$ . We remind the reader that if the unconstrained estimator, denoted by  $\check{\beta}_T$ , would exist, it would be the solution to the first-order conditions:

$$\frac{\partial Q_T(\check{\beta}_T)}{\partial \beta} = 0$$

A standard first-order expansion around the drifting true value would then give

$$\sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\beta_T^*)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \sqrt{T} (\check{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0) = 0$$

(with the common abuse of notation for  $\beta_T^*$  defined for each component of the equation between  $\beta_T^0$  and  $\check{\beta}_T$ ). Then,

$$\sqrt{T} (\check{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0) = - \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\beta_T^*)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta}$$

which justifies, by comparison with the definition of  $\check{\beta}_T$  in (10), the terminology “infeasible unconstrained estimator.”  $\check{\beta}_T$  is obviously asymptotically equivalent to the unconstrained extremum estimator  $\check{\beta}_T$  when it exists. However, the great advantage of  $\check{\beta}_T$  is that it always exists since  $\beta_T^0 \in \text{Int}(\mathbf{B}_T) \cap \mathbf{B}_T^r$  where  $Q_T(\cdot)$  is always defined. In the next subsection we show how to compute a feasible counterpart to  $\check{\beta}_T$ .

However, before doing so, and even though our asymptotic theory is self-contained (see the appendix for a proof of Proposition 1), it is worth analyzing in more details the tight connection with the asymptotic theory of CFS. Interestingly enough, the LHS of equation (9) is identical to the so-called “linear combinations [of the constrained estimator and KT multipliers] that are

asymptotically well behaved” in Proposition 2 of CFS. By “well-behaved” they essentially mean “asymptotically normal,” whereas separately, the constrained estimator and the KT multipliers may not be asymptotically normal when the parameters are close to or on the boundary. When the constraints  $g(\cdot)$  are non-linear, CFS actually consider more complicated linear combinations involving the second derivatives of the constraints  $g(\beta) \geq 0$ . However, their additional term will cancel out when working, as we do in this section, under the null hypothesis that the constraints are fulfilled; in this case, the vector of KT multipliers actually converge to zero, and kill the additional terms in CFS. Hence our result is completely general: the linear combinations studied in CFS are well-behaved under the null, precisely because they correspond asymptotically to the unconstrained extremum estimator.

It is worth noting that this result can be interpreted somewhat ironically. After noting that the constrained estimator (of auxiliary parameters  $\beta$ ) may not be sufficient for I-I, because, one, it may not be asymptotically normal and, two, it may not be sufficient for identification of the structural parameters via the binding function, CFS proposes to augment the set of auxiliary parameters by the KT multipliers. However, equation (9) shows that by recombining them as they did for performing I-I, they are just back to unconstrained estimation! The intuition behind this result is quite clear. In the case of inequality constraints, the constrained estimator is not asymptotically normal because it corresponds to the projection of a (asymptotically) normal vector on a subspace with random dimension corresponding to the non-binding constraints (see the proof of Proposition 1 for more insight about the projection interpretation). On top of this, constraints that are binding in finite sample need not bind at the true value  $\beta_T^0$ , i.e.,  $g_j(\hat{\beta}_T^r) = a_{j,T}$  does not imply  $g_j(\beta_T^0) = 0$ , which adds a bias term that is linear in  $g(\beta_T^0)$ . Fortunately, the non-zero KT multipliers provide precisely the coefficients of the projection on the orthogonal space of binding constraints (and the bias correction), so that by recombining them we regain all the information carried by the unconstrained estimator.

## 2.4 Feasible unconstrained estimation

The feasible unconstrained estimator we propose is tightly related to the theory of constrained estimation developed in Andrews (1999). Consistency of the constrained estimator does not introduce any novel issue. As usual, consistency arguments will be based on compactness and uniform laws of large numbers. However, for our purposes, we require more than consistency and so throughout the remainder we maintain the following assumption.

**Assumption A2:**  $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0) = O_P(1)$ .

As discussed in Andrews (1999), the precise asymptotic distribution of this constrained estimator can be quite complicated. The key tool to understand this asymptotic distribution is the quadratic expansion of the objective function around the true value:

$$Q_T(\beta) = Q_T(\beta_T^0) + \frac{\partial Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta'}(\beta - \beta_T^0) + \frac{1}{2}(\beta - \beta_T^0)' \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} (\beta - \beta_T^0) + R_T(\beta) \quad (11)$$

Two remarks are in order before referring to the results of Andrews (1999). First, our scaling setup is such that  $Q_T(\beta)$  and its derivatives are all seen as sample means that have a well-defined probability limit when  $T \rightarrow \infty$  by virtue of a law of large numbers. Thus, our remainder term  $R_T(\beta)$  must be seen as  $(1/T)$  times the remainder term in Andrews’ expansion (3.2), p

1348. Second, our true unknown value  $\beta_T^0$  is drifting with  $T$  while it is fixed in Andrews (1999). However, it is clear that this will not change the main asymptotic arguments.

It would be natural to consider that the quadratic expansion (11) is well behaved when the remainder term  $R_T(\beta)$  is  $o_P(\|\beta - \beta_T^0\|^2)$  or more precisely when, for all  $\gamma > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{\beta \in \mathbf{B}_T: \sqrt{T}\|\beta - \beta_T^0\| \leq \gamma} |R_T(\beta)| = o_P(1/T) \quad (12)$$

This is precisely Assumption 2 in Andrews (1999). However, he stresses that for his general theory of extremum estimation, a slightly more restrictive assumption is needed (his Assumption 2\*) that we will state as follows.

**Assumption A2\*:** For any sequence  $\gamma_T$  converging to zero

$$\sup_{\beta \in \mathbf{B}_T: \|\beta - \beta_T^0\| \leq \gamma_T} \left\{ \frac{|R_T(\beta)|}{\left[1 + \sqrt{T}\|\beta - \beta_T^0\|\right]^2} \right\} = o_P(1/T)$$

Assumption **A2\*** obviously implies equation (12), which can be seen as taking  $\gamma_T = \gamma/\sqrt{T}$ . Under Assumption **A2\*** (jointly with our Assumptions **A0** and **A1** above), Theorem 1 of Andrews (1999), page 1352, states that<sup>1</sup>

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0) = O_P(1) \quad (13)$$

When taken jointly, equation (13) and Proposition 1 imply

$$\sqrt{T}\hat{\lambda}_T = O_P(1)$$

It is important to note that the infeasible unconstrained estimator  $\ddot{\beta}_T$  is actually the global maximizer of the quadratic approximation of the objective function (around  $\beta_T^0$ ) defined above

$$\ddot{\beta}_T = \arg \max_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\beta}} \left[ Q_T(\beta_T^0) + \frac{\partial Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta'}(\beta - \beta_T^0) + \frac{1}{2}(\beta - \beta_T^0)' \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'}(\beta - \beta_T^0) \right]$$

This definition of  $\ddot{\beta}_T$  suggests that a feasible unconstrained estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T$  can be obtained by replacing  $\beta_T^0$  in the above quadratic approximation by a consistent estimator, namely, the constrained estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$ , which yields

$$\hat{\beta}_T = \arg \max_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\beta}} \left[ Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r) + \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta'}(\beta - \hat{\beta}_T^r) + \frac{1}{2}(\beta - \hat{\beta}_T^r)' \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'}(\beta - \hat{\beta}_T^r) \right]$$

Our main result for this section can now be given.

**Theorem 1:** Under Assumptions **A0-A2**,

$$\hat{\beta}_T = \hat{\beta}_T^r - \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Recall that, strictly speaking, Theorem 1 in Andrews (1999) is written with a fixed  $\beta_T^0 \equiv \beta^0$ .

is asymptotically equivalent to the infeasible unconstrained estimator  $\ddot{\beta}_T$  and also, when it can be defined, to the naive unconstrained estimator  $\check{\beta}_T$

$$\sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T - \ddot{\beta}_T \right) = o_P(1) = \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T - \check{\beta}_T \right).$$

$\hat{\beta}_T$  is obtained simply by taking a Newton-step away from  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$ . In this way, obtaining  $\hat{\beta}_T$  is extremely simple in practice. Throughout the remainder, we will refer to  $\hat{\beta}_T$  as the feasible unconstrained Newton-Raphson (FUNC) estimator of  $\beta_T^0$ . □

Ketz (2016) has proven this result directly in the framework of a drifting true value similar to ours. For the sake of being self-contained, in the appendix we provide a much shorter proof of this result using Theorem 1 of Andrews (1999), the result of which is given in equation (13). To be fair, recall that we have simplified our analysis by admitting that Theorem 1 of Andrews (1999) easily extends to our drifting DGP framework.

For the purpose of I-I based on the FUNC estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T$  of the auxiliary parameters  $\beta$ , it means that we can rewrite our decomposition (9) as follows

$$J_T \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0 \right) - \frac{\partial g'(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} \sqrt{T} \hat{\lambda}_T = J_T \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0 \right) + o_P(1) \quad (14)$$

By working with the computationally friendly FUNC estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T$  we convey exactly the same information about the auxiliary parameters  $\beta$  as the complicated linear combination of constrained estimators and KT multipliers considered by CFS. The implications of this remark for the purpose of I-I are discussed in the subsequent sections.

### 3 Indirect Inference With(Out) Constraints

We observe a sample  $\{y_t\}_{t=1}^T$  generated from a strictly stationary and ergodic probability model  $P_\theta$  depending on the unknown parameter  $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ , with  $\Theta$  compact, and having conditional density  $p(y_t | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}; \theta)$ , where  $\mathbf{Y}_{t-1} = \{y_{t-1}, y_{t-2}, \dots\}$ . We are interested in estimation and inference on the true parameter  $\theta^0 \in \text{Int}(\Theta)$  in situations where maximum likelihood estimation based on  $p(y_t | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}; \theta)$  is infeasible or otherwise unattractive, but simulation from  $p(y_t | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}; \theta)$  is relatively simple.

Note that we simplify the initial GMR framework by not including some exogenous variables that one would not want to simulate. This case would be easy to accommodate at the cost of more involved notations.

I-I proposes to estimate  $\theta^0$  by targeting consistent parameter estimates of a simpler auxiliary model  $f(y_t | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}; \beta)$ , with  $\beta \in \mathbf{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\beta}$  and  $d_\beta \geq d_\theta$ . Denote by  $Q_T(\beta)$  the sample objective function associated with  $f(y_t | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}; \beta)$ . In this setting, the notation  $Q_T(\beta)$  should be understood as a shortcut for

$$Q_T(\beta) = Q_T^0 \left[ \{y_t\}_{t=1}^T, \beta \right]$$

where  $Q_T^0$  is a known deterministic function defined on some Euclidean space of well-suited dimension.

The key input of I-I is a set of  $H$  simulated paths  $\{\tilde{y}_t^{(h)}(\theta)\}_{t=1}^T, h = 1, \dots, H$ . From this input, there are several ways to perform I-I. Our focus of interest in this section is to compare

four strategies. The first two strategies are based on the score matching approach of GT. The approach of CFS and the approach proposed in this paper will produce two distinct, albeit asymptotically equivalent, variants of the score-matching approach. As already mentioned in the comments of Theorem 1, we differ from CFS in that we will not incorporate, explicitly, the KT multipliers as additional auxiliary parameters for I-I since the FUNC estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T$  carries the same information.

The last two strategies are based on the GMR approach of minimum distance between auxiliary parameters. These two strategies differ regarding the parameters to match: constrained estimators of  $\beta$  augmented by KT multipliers, as in CFS, or the user-friendly FUNC estimator proposed in this paper.

By analogy with the trinity of tests, we will dub “Wald approach” the minimum distance approach while the score-matching approach will simply be called “Score approach.” Note that CFS dub CMD (Classical Minimum Distance) the Wald approach and GMM (Generalized Method of Moments) the Score approach. GMR have shown that in classical circumstances (I-I without constraints) the two approaches are asymptotically equivalent. This equivalence will be revisited in the present context.

### 3.1 Score-based Indirect Inference With(out) Constraints

Given  $H$  simulated paths  $\{\tilde{y}_t^{(h)}(\theta)\}_{t=1}^T, h = 1, \dots, H$ , a simulated version of the auxiliary criterion, denoted by  $Q_{TH}(\theta, \beta)$ , can then be constructed for use in I-I. To fix ideas, say we have in mind auxiliary parameters  $\beta$  defined as M-estimators that maximize the criterion

$$Q_T(\beta) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T q(y_t, y_{t-1}, \dots, y_{t-l}; \beta).$$

The simulated auxiliary criterion  $Q_{TH}(\theta, \beta)$  is then constructed by averaging over the  $H$  paths<sup>2</sup>

$$Q_{TH}(\theta, \beta) = \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h=1}^H \tilde{Q}_T^{(h)}(\theta, \beta) = \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h=1}^H \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T q(\tilde{y}_t^{(h)}(\theta), \tilde{y}_{t-1}^{(h)}(\theta), \dots, y_{t-l}^{(h)}(\theta); \beta). \quad (15)$$

We maintain the following regularity conditions on the auxiliary criterion.

**Assumption A3:**

- (i) For any  $\theta \in \Theta$ , the function  $\beta \mapsto Q_T(\theta, \beta)$  is twice continuously differentiable on  $\text{Int}(\mathbf{B}_T) \cap \mathbf{B}_T^r$ .
- (ii) For any  $\beta \in \text{Int}(\mathbf{B}_T) \cap \mathbf{B}_T^r$ , the function  $\theta \mapsto \partial Q_T(\theta, \beta) / \partial \beta$  is continuous on  $\Theta$ .

Given this simulated criterion, the simulated gradient (w.r.t.  $\beta$ ) of the quadratic approximation in (11) is given by

$$\frac{\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} (\beta - \beta_T^0).$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Note that our use of  $Q_{TH}(\cdot)$  is a slight abuse of notation since, in the case of a dynamic model, the probability distribution of  $Q_{TH}(\cdot)$  depends separately on  $T$  and  $H$  and not on the product  $TH$ . This abuse of notation is immaterial for first-order asymptotics.

Replacing the infeasible  $\beta_T^0$  by  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$ , and evaluating this gradient at  $\beta = \hat{\beta}_T$ , we can then use the resulting estimating equations

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{m}_{TH}[\theta; \hat{\beta}_T] &= \frac{\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} (\hat{\beta}_T - \hat{\beta}_T^r) \\ &= \frac{\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} - \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta'}\end{aligned}\quad (16)$$

to carry out a score-based I-I approach. In the absence of constraints for  $\theta$ , this approach yields the following I-I estimator:

$$\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^s(W) = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \bar{m}_{TH}[\theta; \hat{\beta}_T]' \cdot W \cdot \bar{m}_{TH}[\theta; \hat{\beta}_T], \quad (17)$$

where  $W$  is a positive-definite ( $d_\beta \times d_\beta$ ) weighting matrix. Such an estimator will be particularly useful when  $\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \beta)/\partial \beta$  and  $\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \beta)/\partial \beta \partial \beta'$  are known in closed form, or can be calculated numerically with relative ease.

The CFS approach differs in that it uses the information carried by KT multipliers, which leads them to compute

$$\begin{aligned}m_{TH}^{CFS}[\theta; \hat{\lambda}_T] &= \frac{\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial g'(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \cdot \hat{\lambda}_T \\ &= \frac{\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} - \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta}\end{aligned}\quad (18)$$

where the second equality follows from (7). Then, for any positive-definite ( $d_\beta \times d_\beta$ ) weighting matrix  $W$ , CFS would compute their so-called “restricted” score-based I-I estimator as

$$\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W) = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} m_{TH}^{CFS}[\theta; \hat{\lambda}_T]' \cdot W \cdot m_{TH}^{CFS}[\theta; \hat{\lambda}_T] \quad (19)$$

Note that CFS actually define this estimator for “ $H = \infty$ .” It takes only a slight reinforcement of Assumption **A1** to compare our estimator with that of CFS in the general case where  $H$  is a given (finite) number of simulated paths. In particular, we consider the following assumptions.

**Assumption A4:**

(i) There exists a vector function  $L(\theta, \beta^0)$  such that, for any real number  $\gamma > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\|\beta - \beta_T^0\| \leq \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{T}}} \left\| \frac{\partial Q_T(\theta, \beta)}{\partial \beta} - L(\theta, \beta^0) \right\| = o_P(1)$$

(ii) There exists a matrix function  $\mathcal{J}(\theta, \beta^0)$ , taking positive definite values and such that, for any real number  $\gamma > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\|\beta - \beta_T^0\| \leq \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{T}}} \left\| \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\theta, \beta)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} + \mathcal{J}(\theta, \beta^0) \right\| = o_P(1)$$

The comparison of these two I-I estimators will be made in circumstances where both are consistent, thanks to the following identification assumption.

**Assumption A5:**  $L(\theta, \beta^0) = 0 \iff \theta = \theta^0$

While Assumption **A5** is implicitly maintained in CFS (see the two paragraphs before their Assumption two), our explicit treatment of parameters near the boundary forces us to be more cautious. Let us discuss the content of the identification Assumption **A5** in the context of the illustrative example of Subsection 2.1. For sake of expositional simplicity, let us consider an auxiliary model based on conditional normality, with  $\beta = (\psi, \varphi, \pi)'$ . CFS rightly recall that  $\pi$  becomes asymptotically underidentified when  $\varphi = 0$ . CFS circumvent this issue by assuming  $\varphi \geq 0.025$ . In contrast, we propose in this paper an explicit treatment of parameters on the boundary, which may allow the asymptotic true value  $\beta^0 = (\psi^0, \varphi^0, \pi^0)'$  to be such that  $\varphi^0 = 0$ . The reader can easily check that this specific value does not prevent  $\frac{\partial Q_T(\theta, \beta^0)}{\partial \beta}$  from having a well-defined probability limit  $L(\theta, \beta^0)$ . Consider a trial true value  $\theta^0 = (\alpha^0, \delta^0, \sigma_v^0)'$  with  $\delta^0 = 0$ . Then,  $y_t$  is homoskedastic and

$$L(\theta^0, \beta^0) = 0$$

with  $\beta^0 = (\psi^0, \varphi^0, \pi^0)'$  and with

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^0 &= \text{Var}(y_t) = \alpha^0 \\ \varphi^0 &= \pi^0 = 0\end{aligned}$$

But, if  $\theta = (\alpha, \delta, \sigma_v)'$  with  $\delta \neq 0$ , then,  $y_t$  is conditionally heteroskedastic and obviously:

$$L(\theta, \beta^0) \neq 0$$

From this toy example, we conclude that Assumptions **A4** and **A5** are sensible.<sup>3</sup>

Together with **A0-A3**, Assumptions **A4**, **A5** allow us to prove the following result.

**Proposition 2:** Under Assumptions **A0-A5**, for any given  $H \geq 1$ , any positive-definite matrix  $W$ , and any non-negative sequence  $\gamma_T = o(1)$ ,

$$\sup_{\|\theta - \theta^0\| \leq \gamma_T} \left\| \bar{m}_{TH}[\theta; \hat{\beta}_T] - m_{TH}^{CFS}[\theta; \hat{\lambda}_T] \right\| = o_P(1/\sqrt{T})$$

and, in particular  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^s(W)$  and  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W)$  are both consistent asymptotically equivalent estimators of  $\theta^0$

$$\left[ \hat{\theta}_{T,H}^s(W) - \hat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W) \right] = o_P(1/\sqrt{T})$$

□

While CFS referred to their I-I estimator  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W)$  as a “restricted” estimator, we dub our I-I estimator  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^s(W)$  an “unrestricted” estimator since we follow the original score-based approach of GT and match against simulated data the score vector computed at the unrestricted estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T$ . Since we have to resort to a quadratic approximation of the objective function around the

---

<sup>3</sup>The reader may wonder how to identify  $\sigma_v$  in the homoskedastic case. This actually requires matching the kurtosis since in the general case the unconditional kurtosis is

$$\frac{\text{Var}(h_t)}{[E(h_t)]^2} = \exp\left(\frac{\sigma_v^2}{1 - \delta^2}\right) - 1$$

This kurtosis matching is implicitly performed when using a Student-t conditional distribution as an auxiliary model.

unknown true value  $\beta_T^0$ , a feasible version of this approach requires that we replace  $\beta_T^0$  by the constrained estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$ . Since our “unrestricted” I-I estimator  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^s(W)$  is asymptotically equivalent to the restricted I-I estimator  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W)$ , we will set the focus on the former. By doing so, we confirm the discussion given in Section two that, when it comes to the choice of the moments to match, we do not really care about constrained estimation of the auxiliary model. Moreover, inspection of (16) and (18) leads to the following comparison.

In both cases, the leading vector of moments to match to estimate  $\theta$  is just the score vector  $\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)/\partial\beta$ , exactly as in the seminal work of GT. The difference is that since this score vector is computed at the constrained estimator of the auxiliary parameters, it may not be zero on observed data and thus is re-centered by subtracting  $\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)/\partial\beta$ , a quantity that converges to zero under the maintained null hypothesis.

This is the reason why, as far as first-order asymptotics are concerned, it is immaterial to rescale the aforementioned centering term by a sequence of random matrices converging to the identity matrix. Our approach, by including a scaling factor based on the observed Fisher information (see Efron and Hinkley, 1978) of the auxiliary model, implicitly completes the score matching by checking that the simulated data and the observed data do not deliver overly different observed Fisher informations. This additional trimming may intuitively have a positive effect on higher-order asymptotics and finite sample properties.

As mentioned above, since we work under the null hypothesis that the constraints are fulfilled by population parameters, the centering term goes to zero, and as such is not needed for consistency of the I-I estimator of  $\theta$ . If we had directly minimized w.r.t.  $\theta$  the norm of the score  $\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)/\partial\beta$  (computed with the weighting matrix  $W$ ) we may have obtained another consistent, albeit different, I-I estimator of  $\theta$ , say  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^*(W)$ . The motivation for centering is, as first noted by CFS, to mitigate the impact of the non-Gaussian constrained estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$  and deliver an asymptotically normal I-I estimator of  $\theta^0$ . In this way,  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^*(W)$ , i.e., the I-I estimator that minimizes the norm of  $\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)/\partial\beta$ , would not be asymptotically normal (albeit still root  $T$ -consistent), while  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^s(W)$  and  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W)$  are asymptotically equivalent, as proven in Proposition 2, and asymptotically normal under the additional Assumption **A6**, a local identification assumption to complete the global Assumption **A5**.

**Assumption A6:** The vector function  $\theta \mapsto L(\theta, \beta^0)$  is continuously differentiable on  $\text{Int}(\Theta)$  and

$$\text{rank} \left( \frac{\partial L(\theta^0, \beta^0)}{\partial \theta'} \right) = d_\theta$$

We then have the following result, the proof of which follows directly from Proposition 2 and Proposition 2 of CFS, and hence is omitted for brevity.

**Theorem 2:** Under Assumptions **A0-A6**, for any given  $H \geq 1$ ,

$$\sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\theta}_{T,H}^s(W) - \theta^0 \right) \rightarrow_d \mathfrak{N} \left( 0, \left( 1 + \frac{1}{H} \right) \Omega \right)$$

and similarly for  $\sqrt{T} \left( \widehat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W) - \theta^0 \right)$ , with

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega &= A^{-1} B A^{-1} \\ A &= \frac{\partial L(\theta^0, \beta^0)'}{\partial \theta} [\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1} W [\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1} \frac{\partial L(\theta^0, \beta^0)}{\partial \theta'} \\ B &= \frac{\partial L(\theta^0, \beta^0)'}{\partial \theta} [\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1} W [\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1} \mathcal{I}^0 [\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1} W [\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1} \frac{\partial L(\theta^0, \beta^0)}{\partial \theta'}\end{aligned}$$

The optimal weighting matrix  $W$  is given by

$$W^* = \mathcal{J}^0 (\mathcal{I}^0)^{-1} \mathcal{J}^0$$

leading to an optimal I-I estimator with asymptotic variance<sup>4</sup>

$$\left( 1 + \frac{1}{H} \right) \Omega^* = \left( 1 + \frac{1}{H} \right) \left( \frac{\partial L(\theta^0, \beta^0)'}{\partial \theta} [\mathcal{I}^0]^{-1} \frac{\partial L(\theta^0, \beta^0)}{\partial \theta'} \right)^{-1}$$

□

The above formulas are identical to those given in GMR, confirming that we actually perform I-I with **out** constraints. To see this, note that for each value of  $\theta \in \Theta$  we can simulate a path  $\{\tilde{y}_t(\theta)\}_{t=1}^T$  and compute a constrained estimator

$$\tilde{\beta}_T^r(\theta) = \arg \max_{\beta \in \mathbf{B}_T^r} Q_T(\theta, \beta)$$

For sake of interpretation, let us consider the simplest case without boundary problems. Then, the constrained estimator  $\tilde{\beta}_T^r(\theta)$  converges towards a (non-drifting) pseudo-true value  $b(\theta)$  that is in the interior of the parameter set. Then, while KT multipliers converge to zero, we have

$$\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\partial Q_T(\theta, \tilde{\beta}_T^r(\theta))}{\partial \beta} = L(\theta, b(\theta)) = 0, \forall \theta \in \Theta$$

In particular, by differentiating the above

$$\frac{\partial L(\theta^0, \beta^0)}{\partial \theta'} + \frac{\partial L(\theta^0, \beta^0)}{\partial \beta'} \frac{\partial b(\theta^0)}{\partial \theta'} = 0$$

we have

$$\frac{\partial L(\theta^0, \beta^0)}{\partial \theta'} = \mathcal{J}^0 \frac{\partial b(\theta^0)}{\partial \theta'}$$

Therefore,

$$\Omega^* = \left\{ \frac{\partial b'(\theta^0)}{\partial \theta} \mathcal{J}^0 [\mathcal{I}^0]^{-1} \mathcal{J}^0 \frac{\partial b(\theta^0)}{\partial \theta'} \right\}^{-1},$$

and we recognize the familiar formula given by GMR (see their Proposition 4) for the asymptotic variance of the optimal I-I estimator.

---

<sup>4</sup>The reader may notice that the formula for  $\Omega^*$  given above differs from that given in Proposition 4 of CFS, denoted as  $\mathcal{C}_0^r$  in their equation (8). However, it is simple to verify that the two coincide under the null as the KT multipliers are zero in the limit.

## 3.2 Wald-based Indirect Inference With(Out) Constraints

The aforementioned tight connection with the results of GMR suggest that it should be possible to perform I-I with **out** constraints in an alternative, albeit asymptotically equivalent, manner using the Wald approach and our well-behaved unconstrained estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T$ . The philosophy of the Wald approach to I-I would then amount to compute an unconstrained estimator  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}(\theta)$  on simulated data (for any given value  $\theta$  of the structural parameters) and then to minimize, in some norm,  $\hat{\beta}_T - \tilde{\beta}_{TH}(\theta)$ . We show in this section that this approach may work, but requires care in the definition of  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}(\theta)$ .

### 3.2.1 A First Solution: the CFS Strategy

The Wald-based I-I strategy of CFS, which uses constrained auxiliary parameter estimates, can be reinterpreted as a minimum distance I-I approach based on a vector of unconstrained auxiliary parameter estimates. To see this, first define the Wald-based estimator of CFS as

$$\check{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W) = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\beta}_T^r - \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta) \\ \hat{\lambda}_T - \tilde{\lambda}_{TH}(\theta) \end{bmatrix}' K_0^{r'} \cdot W^\boxplus \cdot K_0^r \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\beta}_T^r - \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta) \\ \hat{\lambda}_T - \tilde{\lambda}_{TH}(\theta) \end{bmatrix} \quad (20)$$

with

$$W^\boxplus = \begin{bmatrix} W & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta) = \arg \max_{\beta \in \mathbf{B}_{TH}^r} Q_{TH}(\theta, \beta)$$

where  $\tilde{\lambda}_{TH}(\theta)$  is the vector of KT multipliers delivered by this constrained optimization. Recall that we have simplified the exposition by considering only auxiliary parameter estimates  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta)$  defined as above. Alternatively, we could consider auxiliary parameters based on  $H$  simulated paths of length  $T$ :

$$\tilde{\beta}_T^{r(h)}(\theta) = \arg \max_{\beta \in \mathbf{B}_T^r} \tilde{Q}_T^{(h)}(\theta, \beta), h = 1, \dots, H$$

and then compute<sup>5</sup>

$$\bar{\beta}_{T,H}^r(\theta) = \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h=1}^H \tilde{\beta}_T^{r(h)}(\theta)$$

The function  $Q_T(\theta, \beta)$  and its derivatives can be computed for  $\beta = \bar{\beta}_{T,H}^r(\theta)$  if  $\mathbf{B}_T^r$  is a convex set. A sufficient condition for that is to assume that the set  $\mathbf{B}_T$  is convex and the functions  $g_j(\cdot), j = 1, \dots, q$  defining the constraints are concave.

Note that the structure of  $W^\boxplus$  used in the definition of  $\check{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W)$  (equation (20)) implies that under the null hypothesis only the upper portion of the matrix  $K_0^r$  matters, which, following CFS, is given by

$$K_{0,1}^r = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathcal{J}^0 & : & \frac{\partial g'(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} \end{bmatrix}$$

---

<sup>5</sup>Extending the results of GMR, we can conclude that  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta)$  and  $\bar{\beta}_{T,H}^r(\theta)$  are asymptotically equivalent and would lead to asymptotically equivalent I-I estimators of  $\theta$ . However, the results of Gourieroux, Renault and Touzi (2000) suggest that an I-I estimator based on  $\bar{\beta}_{T,H}^r(\theta)$  will have better finite sample properties, at the cost of performing  $H$  optimizations in the auxiliary model instead of only just one. This discussion is beyond the scope of this paper.

It must be acknowledged that a more complicated definition for the left block of  $K_{0,1}^r$  is given in CFS. However, this complication is immaterial in our setting as we work under the null hypothesis that the constraints are fulfilled, and thus the population (resp., estimated) vector of KT multipliers is zero (resp.,  $O_P(1/\sqrt{T})$ ). As a matter of fact, and even though this is not explicitly discussed in CFS, the above estimator becomes feasible only when  $K_{0,1}^r$  is replaced by a consistent estimator like

$$\hat{K}_{0,1,T}^r = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \quad : \quad \frac{\partial g'(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{c} -\hat{J}_T \quad : \quad \frac{\partial g'(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \end{array} \right]$$

Hence, for the sake of feasibility, we should rather consider

$$\check{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W) = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \hat{\beta}_T^r - \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta) \\ \hat{\lambda}_T - \tilde{\lambda}_{TH}(\theta) \end{array} \right]' \hat{K}_{0,1,T}^{r'} \cdot W \cdot \hat{K}_{0,1,T}^r \left[ \begin{array}{c} \hat{\beta}_T^r - \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta) \\ \hat{\lambda}_T - \tilde{\lambda}_{TH}(\theta) \end{array} \right] \quad (21)$$

Since the two estimators (20) and (21) are obviously asymptotically equivalent, we simplify the exposition by denoting them identically, even though only (21) is feasible. Note that, under the null hypothesis that the constraints are fulfilled in the population, it would also be asymptotically equivalent to estimate  $K_{0,1}^r$  by plugging in the unconstrained (FUNC) estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T$  instead of the constrained one  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$ .

Just as with the score-based approach to I-I, we can now interpret the Wald-based I-I estimator of CFS as I-I without **out** constraints. To do so, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{K}_{0,1,T}^r \left[ \begin{array}{c} \hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0 \\ \hat{\lambda}_T \end{array} \right] &= \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} (\hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0) + \frac{\partial g'(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \hat{\lambda}_T \\ &= -\hat{J}_T (\hat{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0) + o_P(1/\sqrt{T}) \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from equation (14). Therefore, an asymptotically equivalent version of the CFS Wald-based I-I estimator could be computed as

$$\bar{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W) = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \left( \hat{\beta}_T - \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{CFS}(\theta) \right)' \hat{J}_T W \hat{J}_T \left( \hat{\beta}_T - \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{CFS}(\theta) \right)$$

where we define  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{CFS}(\theta)$  as

$$\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{CFS}(\theta) = \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta) + \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial g'(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \tilde{\lambda}_{TH}(\theta) \quad (22)$$

Note that the notation  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{CFS}(\theta)$  is justified by analogy with the relationships

$$\hat{\beta}_T = \hat{\beta}_T^r - \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \quad (23)$$

$$= \hat{\beta}_T^r + \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial g'(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \hat{\lambda}_T \quad (24)$$

This reinterpretation of the so-called “restricted” Wald approach to I-I, as dubbed by CFS, is an unconstrained I-I approach based (through equation (22)) on our FUNC estimator. Therefore,

we have a similar message to the score-based approach. This is confirmed by Proposition 5 and 6 of CFS which yield the following insights.

- (i) For any choice of the positive definite weighting matrix  $W$  (or more generally for any sequence of sample dependent positive-definite weighting matrices  $W_T$  with a positive-definite limit), the score-based I-I estimator  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W)$  and the Wald-based I-I estimator  $\check{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W)$  are asymptotically equivalent.
- (ii) For  $T$  sufficiently large, the two estimators are numerically equal in the case of an auxiliary model that just identifies the structural parameters because  $d_\beta = d_\theta$ .

Point (i) above revisits the results of GMR (see their Section 2.5 page S91), demonstrating that, for any choice of the weighting matrix  $W$ , the score-based approach with weighting matrix  $W$  is asymptotically equivalent to the Wald-based approach with weighting matrix  $\hat{J}_T W \hat{J}_T$  as in the definition of  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W)$ . In the case of a just identified auxiliary model, the choice of the weighting matrix is immaterial and point (ii) calls to mind Proposition 4.1. in Gourieroux and Monfort (1996). Once more, this similarity to the results of GMR and Gourieroux and Monfort (1996) confirms that we are actually performing I-I with **out** constraints. In addition, since our unrestricted score-based I-I estimator  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^s(W)$  is asymptotically equivalent to the restricted score-based estimator  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W)$  (see Theorem 2), it is also (by point (i) above) asymptotically equivalent to the alternative aforementioned Wald-based estimators of CFS:  $\check{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W)$  and  $\bar{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W)$ .

### 3.2.2 A Second Solution: Back to the Score

The previous subsection revisited the Wald-based CFS estimator by resorting to a definition of  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}(\theta)$  that mimics, on simulated data, the alternative definition of the FUNC estimator given in equation (24). We can alternatively use a definition of  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}(\theta)$  that mimics equation (23). To see this, recall that our score-based approach was focused on minimizing, in some norm,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{m}_{TH}[\theta; \hat{\beta}_T] &= \frac{\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} (\hat{\beta}_T - \hat{\beta}_T^r) \\ &= \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right] \left\{ \hat{\beta}_T - \hat{\beta}_T^r + \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \right\} \\ &= \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right] \left\{ \hat{\beta}_T - \tilde{\beta}_{T,H}^c(\theta) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\beta}_{T,H}^c(\theta) = \hat{\beta}_T^r - \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \quad (25)$$

Let us acknowledge, however, an important difference of philosophy between the definitions of  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{CFS}(\theta)$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^c(\theta)$ . In the former case, we make a Newton-Raphson improvement of  $\hat{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta)$ , while in the latter case we remain true to  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$ . In this respect, we obviously set the focus on score matching and, as a consequence, a comparison with our score-based approach is straightforward. More precisely, if we define another Wald-based I-I estimator, the solution of

$$\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^c(W) = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \left( \hat{\beta}_T - \tilde{\beta}_{T,H}^c(\theta) \right)' \hat{J}_T W \hat{J}_T \left( \hat{\beta}_T - \tilde{\beta}_{T,H}^c(\theta) \right)$$

we see that, from the formulas above, this minimization program can be equivalently written as

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta} \bar{m}_{TH}[\theta; \hat{\beta}_T] \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \hat{J}_T W \hat{J}_T \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \bar{m}_{TH}[\theta; \hat{\beta}_T] \quad (26)$$

which is nothing but minimizing a certain norm of  $\bar{m}_{TH}[\theta; \hat{\beta}_T]$  exactly as in equation (17).<sup>6</sup>

The asymptotic distribution of  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^c(W)$  obviously depends on the limit of the weighting matrix sequence (at  $\theta^0$ ) given by

$$\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta^0, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \hat{J}_T W \hat{J}_T \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta^0, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} = W$$

We can then conclude that this Wald-based I-I estimator  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^c(W)$  is asymptotically equivalent to the score-based I-I estimator  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^s(W)$  introduced in Section three. In other words, all I-I estimators discussed so far (for the same weighting matrix  $W$ ) are asymptotically equivalent, exactly as in GMR.

Interestingly enough, our unconstrained view of I-I results in numerical equivalence between this Wald-based I-I estimator and our score-based I-I estimator when the dimension of the auxiliary and structural parameters are equal.

**Theorem 3:** For  $T$  sufficiently large and in the case of a just identified auxiliary model ( $d_\beta = d_\theta$ ), the estimators  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^s(W)$  and  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^c(W^*)$  are numerically equivalent irrespective of the choice of weighting matrix (i.e.,  $W \neq W^*$ ).  $\square$

To conclude this subsection, it is worth comparing, in more detail, the two definitions of  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}(\theta)$  that have delivered Wald-based I-I estimators (by calibration against the FUNC estimator) that are asymptotically equivalent to the score-based approach:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{CFS}(\theta) &= \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta) + \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial g'(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \tilde{\lambda}_{TH}(\theta) \\ \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^c(\theta) &= \hat{\beta}_T^r - \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta'} \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{CFS}(\theta)$  is based on constrained estimation on the simulated path, through the computation of  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta)$  and  $\tilde{\lambda}_{TH}(\theta)$ , one may wish to revisit  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^c(\theta)$  by also using constrained estimators on the simulated path, that is by instead computing

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{func}(\theta) &= \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta) - \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta))}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta))}{\partial \beta'} \\ &= \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta) + \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\theta, \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta))}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial g'(\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta))}{\partial \beta} \tilde{\lambda}_{TH}(\theta) \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>6</sup> It might be argued that we are not exactly minimizing a norm w.r.t.  $\theta$  since the weighting matrix itself depends on  $\theta$ . However, it must be realized that this is immaterial, both for consistency and asymptotic distribution, to replace the occurrence of  $\theta$  in the weighting matrix by a first-step consistent estimator. This argument is quite similar to the one of equivalence between continuously updated GMM (Hansen, Heaton and Yaron, 1996) and efficient two-step GMM.

$\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{func}(\theta)$  is the FUNC estimator computed on the simulated path, and it seems sensible to match it against the FUNC estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T$  computed on the observed data. However, this approach will not deliver a consistent estimator of  $\theta^0$  in general. To see this, note that  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{CFS}(\theta)$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{func}(\theta)$  both set the focus on the same linear combination of  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^r(\theta)$  and  $\tilde{\lambda}_{TH}(\theta)$ . However, while  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{CFS}(\theta)$  is guaranteed to end up with a consistent estimator for the coefficients of this linear combination, the coefficients in  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{func}(\theta)$  themselves depend on the unknown  $\theta$ . As a consequence, setting the focus on  $[\hat{\beta}_T - \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{func}(\theta)]$  alone, or some norm thereof, can induce an additional perverse solution in the limit that is distinct from  $\theta^0$ ; i.e., the limiting estimating equations, because of their nonlinear dependence on  $\theta$ , can admit an additional solution  $\bar{\theta}$  with  $\bar{\theta} \neq \theta^0$ . As such, an I-I strategy based on  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^{func}(\theta)$  above may not identify  $\theta^0$ .<sup>7</sup>

## 4 An Illustrative Example

In this section we apply our score-based I-I approach to estimate the parameters of the stochastic volatility (SV) model:

$$y_t = \sqrt{h_t} e_t \quad (27)$$

$$\ln(h_t) = \alpha + \delta \ln(h_{t-1}) + \sigma_v v_t, \quad (28)$$

where  $|\delta| < 1$ ,  $\sigma_v > 0$ ,  $(e_t, v_t)' \sim_{i.i.d.} N(0, \text{Id}_2)$  and  $\theta = (\alpha, \delta, \sigma_v)'$ . We observe a series  $\{y_t\}_{t=1}^T$  from the SV model in (27)-(28) and our goal is to conduct inference on  $\theta$ . This simple example was considered first in Section two.

Following the discussion in Section two, we consider the GARCH(1,1) auxiliary model

$$y_t = \sqrt{h_t} \epsilon_t \quad (29)$$

$$h_t = \psi + \varphi y_{t-1}^2 + \pi h_{t-1}^2$$

where the errors  $\epsilon_t$  in (29) are  $\epsilon_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \sim N(0, 1)$  or  $\epsilon_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$  Student-t with  $1/\eta$  degrees of freedom. The auxiliary parameters are denoted by  $\beta$ , with  $\beta = (\psi, \varphi, \pi)'$  if  $\epsilon_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \sim N(0, 1)$  and  $\beta = (\psi, \varphi, \pi, \eta)'$  otherwise.

As mentioned in Section two, to ensure the GARCH(1,1) auxiliary model is well-behaved we require the following inequality constraints

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_T &\geq \bar{\varphi}_T, \quad 0 < \bar{\varphi}_T, \quad \bar{\varphi}_T = o(1) \\ 0 &\leq \eta_T \leq \bar{\eta}_T, \quad 0 < 0.5 - \bar{\eta}_T = o(1), \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Note that, unlike the approach of CFS, by considering drifting sequences of auxiliary parameters the constrained estimator can fully reach the boundary of constrained space, in the limit.

### 4.1 Monte Carlo Design

To assess the performance of our proposed I-I estimation strategy we follow the Monte Carlo design of Jacquier, Polson and Rossi (1994) (JPR, hereafter), also used in CFS. In particular, we

---

<sup>7</sup>Frazier and Renault (2016) give additional examples of settings where such perverse roots can arise in nonlinear econometric models.

consider two sets of structural parameters:  $\theta^{0,1} = (-.736, .90, .363)'$  and  $\theta^{0,2} = (-.147, .98, .0614)'$ . These particular values for  $\theta^0$  are related to the unconditional coefficient of variation  $\kappa$  for the unobserved level of volatility  $h_t$ , where

$$\kappa^2 = \frac{\text{Var}(h_t)}{(E[h_t])^2} = \exp\left(\frac{\sigma_v^2}{1 - \delta}\right) - 1.$$

In the first design, i.e.,  $\theta^0 = \theta^{0,1}$ , we have  $\kappa^2 = 1$ , which roughly represents lower-frequency returns (say, weekly or monthly returns); for the second design, i.e.,  $\theta^0 = \theta^{0,2}$ , we set  $\kappa^2 = .1$ , which roughly corresponds to higher-frequency returns (say, daily returns).

To understand the limitations of our proposed strategy we analyze the finite sample performance of our I-I methodology when the pseudo-log-likelihood is Gaussian; i.e.,  $\epsilon_t$  in (29) is  $\epsilon_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1} \sim N(0, 1)$ . As noted in Kim et al. (1998) and CFS, this auxiliary model and constraint combination is not well-equipped to handle the thick-tailed behavior exhibited by series generated from the log-normal SV model. However, the constraints on the auxiliary parameters are more likely to be binding since this auxiliary model is a cruder approximation of the structural model than the case where  $\epsilon_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$  is Student-t. Therefore, it is not certain if the inadequacy of the Gaussian GARCH(1,1) auxiliary model described in Kim et al. (1998) is due to the model itself, the bindings constraints or a mixture of both issues. In this way, we can determine if the FUNC based auxiliary estimator is able to mitigate these issues since it captures, in some sense, the impact of the constraints.

The score based I-I objective function does not require a weighting matrix as we are in the just identified setting; i.e., we choose  $W = I$ . We fix the number of data replications to be  $H = 10$  across all Monte Carlo designs.<sup>8</sup>

We illustrate the stable performance of our proposed I-I estimator across three different sample sizes,  $T = 500, 1000, 2000$ , and consider 1000 Monte Carlo replications for each sample size/parameter specification, leading to six separate specifications in total.

## 4.2 Monte Carlo Results

### 4.2.1 Simulation Design one: $\theta_1^0 = (-.736, .90, .363)'$

To understand the difference between the constrained and unconstrained auxiliary estimators, Table 1 contains the frequency of binding constraints for the GARCH(1,1) auxiliary parameter estimates when the  $\bar{\varphi}_T$  term is given by  $\bar{\varphi}_T = .1 \cdot T^{-.49}$ . Recall that, in their assessment, CFS employ the constraint  $\varphi \geq .025$ . Following our previous discussion, we believe it is more informative to consider a drifting bound. For each replication, we calculate the auxiliary estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$  subject to the constraints in (30), where  $\bar{\varphi}_T = .1 * T^{-.49}$ , and calculate  $\hat{\beta}_T$  by taking a Newton-step from  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$ . While no constraints are used in the calculation of  $\hat{\beta}_T$  it is informative to ascertain the number of times this estimator would have caused the constraints to bind or be violated, as this will tell us, to some extent, what using the unconstrained  $\hat{\beta}_T$  buys us, at least in comparison with  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$ .

---

<sup>8</sup> Optimization is carried out using an iterative Gauss-Seidel grid search approach. Starting values were obtained by first running a crude grid search over  $\Theta$  and choosing the corresponding grid values that minimized the I-I objective function. Only one iteration of the minimization procedure was carried out and more efficient estimates could be obtained by considering multiple iterations.

Table 1 demonstrates that even in the case of  $\theta^0 = \theta^{0,1}$ , i.e., a relatively large unconditional coefficient of variation, the constraints for the auxiliary model are binding in a non-negligible portion on the replications. Interestingly, the FUNC estimator violates the constraint  $\varphi \geq \bar{\varphi}_T$  much less frequently than the proportion of cases for which this constraint is binding for the constrained estimator.

Summary statistics for the resulting score-based I-I parameter estimates of  $\theta^0$  are collected in Table 2. The results show that this I-I approach behaves well in finite samples, regardless of the constraints for the auxiliary model. To further understand the finite-sample properties of these estimators, we plot, using a Gaussian kernel, the sampling distributions of the  $\delta$  and  $\sigma_v$  estimators across the three sample sizes  $T = 500, 1000, 2000$ .<sup>9</sup> The results of Figures 1 and 2 are similar to those reported on page 963 in CFS, with our approach seemingly yielding a slightly tighter sampling distribution for  $\sigma_v$ .

#### 4.2.2 Simulation Design Two: $\theta_2^0 = (-.141, .98, .0614)'$

Analyzing the frequency of binding constraints for the second Monte Carlo design, we find a very similar story to the first Monte Carlo design. Namely, we find a relatively large number of replications where the constraint  $\varphi \geq .1 * T^{-.49}$  binds, and a relatively large number of replications where the FUNC estimator does not satisfy the constraint  $\varphi + \pi \leq 1$ . Again, the FUNC estimator satisfies the constraint  $\varphi \geq \bar{\varphi}_T$  more often than the naive estimator. Note, however, for this parameter configuration the constraint is violated by the FUNC estimator, and binds in the case of the constrained estimator, much more often (between 50% and 100% more often) than in the first parameter configuration. As already discussed by CFS, a small unconditional coefficient of variation for volatility creates a more challenging estimation problem and this has a perverse impact on the frequency of binding constraints for this Gaussian auxiliary model.

Summary statistics for the resulting score-based I-I parameter estimates of  $\theta^0$  are collected in Table 4, with the results reflecting the same conclusions as those obtained in the first Monte Carlo design. The sampling distribution of the  $\delta$  and  $\sigma_v$  estimators for the second Monte Carlo design are contained in Figures 3 and 4. Again, the figures demonstrate that this approach works well, with the results being comparable to those obtained by CFS (see their page 964).

## 5 Indirect Inference with False Equality Constraints

In many cases intractability of the likelihood is due entirely to a sub-vector of structural parameters. Examples include, for instance, dynamic discrete choice models with ARMA errors (Robinson, 1982, Gourieroux et al., 1985, Poirier and Ruud, 1988), spatial discrete choice models (see, e.g., Pinsky and Slade, 1998), and many dynamic equilibrium models.

As an illustrative example of this phenomena, let  $\theta = (\theta'_1, \theta'_2)'$  and consider the dynamic probit model

$$y_t = \mathbb{1}[x'_t \theta_1 + u_t > 0] \equiv \mathbb{1}[x'_t \theta_1 + \theta_2 u_{t-1} + \nu_t > 0], \quad \nu_t \sim_{iid} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

It is precisely the autoregressive nature of  $u_t$ , captured by  $\theta_2 \neq 0$ , that ensures only an integral representation of the likelihood for this model is feasible. Similarly, for the stochastic volatility

---

<sup>9</sup>To ensure that all plots adequately represent the various sampling distributions and neatly fit in the same figure, we have thrown out 1.5% of the lower tail observations for each series in Figures 1-4.

model discussed earlier, if the volatility persistence parameter was zero the likelihood for the SV model would be tractable.

More generally, many complex economic models are such that imposing a (potentially false) constraint of the form  $g(\theta) = 0$  on the structural model yields a model that admits a computationally tractable likelihood. This is precisely the reason why score/LM tests are popular in econometrics: estimation and testing “under the null”, i.e.,  $g(\theta) = 0$ , is feasible even in very complicated models. Unfortunately, imposition of this constraint, and subsequent optimization of the constrained log-likelihood, will not deliver consistent estimates of the structural parameters if the constraint is not valid at the truth ( $g(\theta^0) \neq 0$ ).

As recently pointed out by Calvet and Czellar (2015), imposing potentially false equality constraints on a given structural model can be a very useful way of obtaining simple and rich auxiliary models for the purposes of I-I. For instance, in the context of a long-run risk (LRR) model (Bansal and Yaron, 2004), Calvet and Czellar (2015) demonstrate that imposing specific equality constraints on certain parameters produces a simple auxiliary model for use in I-I (with a computationally tractable likelihood function) that closely resemble the structural model. From the standpoint of I-I, the fact that this resulting auxiliary model may not deliver consistent estimates of  $\theta^0$  is immaterial so long as we can augment the resulting auxiliary model in such a way as to ensure the I-I identification condition is satisfied. The benefits of such an I-I approach are two-fold: one, by using constraints  $g(\theta) = 0$  to define the auxiliary model, we sketch a systematic strategy for the choice of auxiliary model; two, this auxiliary model closely matches the structural model and so for issues of robustness and efficiency this auxiliary model is very useful.

Motivated by the above ideas and our simple approach to handling constraints within I-I, we propose a novel approach to I-I based on constraining the structural model parameters according to  $g(\theta) = 0$  to create a simple, but highly informative, auxiliary model with which to estimate the structural parameters  $\theta$ . By doing so, we complete the general strategy put forward by Calvet and Czellar (2015) by providing an automatic, and intuitively nearly efficient, way to build a simple auxiliary model to identify the structural parameters.

## 5.1 The General Approach

We assume again that likelihood estimation based on the transition density  $p(y_t|\mathbf{Y}_{t-1};\theta)$  is infeasible or unattractive. Now, we assume there is a vector of equality constraints

$$g(\theta) = 0, \tag{31}$$

such that, for any  $\theta$  satisfying  $g(\theta) = 0$ , the transition density  $p(y_t|\mathbf{Y}_{t-1};\theta)$  leads to a tractable conditional log-likelihood:

$$Q_T(\theta) = \sum_{t=1}^T \log(p(y_t|\mathbf{Y}_{t-1};\theta))$$

However, we do not believe that the constraints in (31) are fulfilled. Our only concern is that when imposed they ensure the constrained log-likelihood can be easily optimized.

Imposing  $g(\theta) = 0$  implicitly defines an auxiliary model that can be used for the purposes of I-I. Parameter estimates of this auxiliary model are obtained by solving the program

$$\max_{\beta \in \mathbf{B}} Q_T(\beta) \text{ s.t. } g(\beta) = 0, \tag{32}$$

The notation  $\beta$  reminds the reader that we do not believe that the constrained optimization (32) delivers a consistent estimator of the true unknown value  $\theta^0$ . It will instead deliver  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$  a consistent estimator of a pseudo-true value  $\beta^0$  that will coincide with  $\theta^0$  only if the restrictions in (31) are satisfied at  $\theta^0$ . The constrained estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$  and the Lagrangian vector  $\hat{\lambda}_T$  are defined as the solutions to the first-order conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial g'(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \hat{\lambda}_T \\ 0 &= g(\hat{\beta}_T^r) \end{aligned}$$

Since the equality constraints are imposed merely for computational simplicity, and are enforced within estimation, there is no reason to complicate the discussion by considering auxiliary parameters whose true value is specified using a drifting DGP. That is, we deviate from the previous sections and no longer consider drifting true values  $\beta_T^0$  for the auxiliary parameter estimates. Therefore, in this section Assumption **A0** is no longer needed. Likewise, Assumption **A1** and Assumption **A2** must be altered as follows.

**Assumption A1':** (Objective function) The function  $\beta \mapsto Q_T(\beta)$  is twice continuously differentiable on  $\text{Int}(\mathbf{B})$  (with  $\mathbf{B} = \Theta$ ) and there exists a pseudo-true value  $\beta^0 \in \text{Int}(\mathbf{B})$  such that:

- (i)  $\sqrt{T} \left[ \frac{\partial Q_T(\beta^0)}{\partial \beta} - L(\theta^0, \beta^0) \right] \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{I}^0)$
- (ii) For any  $\beta_T^* \in \text{Int}(\mathbf{B})$  satisfying  $\beta_T^* - \beta^0 = o_P(1)$ ,  $\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\beta_T^*)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} = -\mathcal{J}^0$

Where  $\mathcal{I}^0$  and  $\mathcal{J}^0$  are non-stochastic ( $d_\beta \times d_\beta$ ) positive definite matrices.

Note that in general  $\mathcal{I}^0 \neq \mathcal{J}^0$ , even though  $Q_T(\beta)$  is the correct log-likelihood. The reason for this discrepancy is that the Hessian matrix is computed at  $\beta^0$ , which is not the true unknown value  $\theta^0$  of  $\theta$  when we are not working under the null; i.e., when  $g(\theta^0) \neq 0$ .

**Assumption A2':** The constrained estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$  is a  $\sqrt{T}$ -consistent estimator of the pseudo-true value  $\beta^0$ :

$$\sqrt{T} (\hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta^0) = O_P(1)$$

It is important to keep in mind that  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$  is generally ineffective for consistent estimation of the structural parameters  $\theta^0$  (meaning  $\beta^0 \neq \theta^0$ ) unless of course the constraints in (31) are valid. When these constraints are not valid for  $\theta^0$ , it will generally be the case that

$$\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{\partial Q_T(\beta^0)}{\partial \beta} \right\} = L(\theta^0, \beta^0) \neq 0.$$

Thus, the identification condition given in Assumption **A5**, and stated as  $L(\theta, \beta^0) = 0 \iff \theta = \theta^0$ , is no longer sensible. To understand this issue, recall that  $d_\beta = d_\theta$  and note that it is generally the case that there exists some  $\theta^+ \in \Theta$ , such that

$$\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{\partial Q_T(\theta^+, \beta^0)}{\partial \beta} \right\} = L(\theta^+, \beta^0) = 0,$$

however,  $\theta^+$  and  $\theta^0$  will differ in general. In other words, consistent and asymptotically normal I-I estimation of the true structural parameters  $\theta^0$  can not be based on the sample counterpart

of the estimating equations  $L(., \beta^0)$  by themselves. More precisely, let us consider the two I-I score estimators  $\widehat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W)$  and  $\widehat{\theta}_{T,H}^s(W)$  proposed in Section three. In this just identified case, the weighting matrix  $W$  is immaterial and the estimators  $\widehat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}$  and  $\widehat{\theta}_{T,H}^s$  can be deduced by solving, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} m_{TH}^{CFS}[\widehat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}; \hat{\lambda}_T] &= 0 \\ \bar{m}_{TH}[\widehat{\theta}_{T,H}^s; \hat{\beta}_T] &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} m_{TH}^{CFS}[\theta; \hat{\lambda}_T] &= \frac{\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} - \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \\ \bar{m}_{TH}[\theta; \hat{\beta}_T] &= \frac{\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} - \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \end{aligned}$$

To understand what is required for the above I-I estimators  $\widehat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}$  and  $\widehat{\theta}_{T,H}^s$  to be consistent, we first note that, under **Assumptions A2'** and **A4**, uniformly on  $\theta \in \Theta$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} m_{TH}^{CFS}[\theta; \hat{\lambda}_T] &= L(\theta, \beta^0) - L(\theta^0, \beta^0) \\ \text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \bar{m}_{TH}[\theta; \hat{\beta}_T] &= L(\theta, \beta^0) - \mathcal{J}(\theta, \beta^0) [\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1} L(\theta^0, \beta^0) \end{aligned}$$

From the above it is clear that consistent estimation of  $\theta^0$  requires one of the two following identification conditions.

**Assumption A5':**

- (i)  $\theta^0$  is the unique  $\theta \in \Theta$  such that  $L(\theta, \beta^0) = L(\theta^0, \beta^0)$ .
- (ii)  $\theta^0$  is the unique  $\theta \in \Theta$  such that  $[\mathcal{J}(\theta, \beta^0)]^{-1} L(\theta, \beta^0) = [\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1} L(\theta^0, \beta^0)$ .

More precisely, the following result automatically follows.

**Proposition 3:** Under Assumptions **A1'**, **A2'**, **A3**, **A4** and **A5'(i)**

$$\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS} = \theta^0$$

Under Assumptions **A1'**, **A2'**, **A3**, **A4** and **A5'(ii)**

$$\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\theta}_{T,H}^s = \theta^0$$

□

Recall that CFS have already implicitly used Assumption **A5'(i)** to ensure the consistency of their constrained I-I estimator under possibly misspecified constraints. However, the more specific setting considered in this section will allow us to give more primitive sufficient conditions for the validity of this high-level assumption. First note that while Assumption **A5'** is implied by the more standard Assumption **A5** “under the null” (i.e. when the true unknown value  $\theta^0$  fulfills the restrictions so that  $L(\theta^0, \beta^0) = 0$ ), it should also be true in a  $\sqrt{T}$ -neighborhood of the null since the score test has power against sequences of local alternatives.

The local power of the score test is an increasing function of the norm of  $[\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1/2} L(\theta^0, \beta^0)$ , which somewhat bridges the gap between the two versions of Assumption **A5'**, which are actually identical under the null. Note that, when we are not under the null, there is no general logical implication between the two assumptions: Assumption **A5'(i)** does not imply Assumption **A5'(ii)** because  $L(\theta, \beta^0)$  and  $L(\theta^0, \beta^0)$ , albeit different, may coincide when left-multiplied respectively by  $[\mathcal{J}(\theta, \beta^0)]^{-1}$  and  $[\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1}$ ; conversely, a similar argument obviously holds the other way round.

To better understand the difference between the constrained estimation approach considered herein, based on either  $m_{TH}^{CFS}$  or  $\bar{m}_{TH}$ , and the approach of Calvet and Czellar (2015), let us partition  $\theta$  as  $\theta = (\theta'_1, \theta'_2)'$  and assume the equality constraints are given by  $\theta_2 = \bar{\theta}_2$ . In this setting, a score-based I-I version of the approach in Calvet and Czellar (2015) would use as information for estimation of  $\theta^0$  the constrained partial score  $\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_{1T}^r, \bar{\beta}_2)/\partial \beta_1$ . As Calvet and Czellar (2015) note,  $\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_{1T}^r, \bar{\beta}_2)/\partial \beta_1$  is insufficient to identify  $\theta^0$  and so the authors propose to use as the auxiliary criterion some norm of

$$\left( \frac{\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_{1T}^r, \bar{\beta}_2)}{\partial \beta_1}, \bar{\varphi}'_{TH}(\theta) \right)'$$

where  $\varphi_{TH}(\theta)$  is a vector of *ad hoc* simulated moments meant to identify  $\theta_2$ . In contrast, our approach, and the approach of CFS, bases identification on the information contained in  $\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_{1T}^r, \bar{\beta}_2)/\partial \beta$  and  $\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r, \bar{\beta}_2)/\partial \beta$ . In this way, our approach does not rely on the existence, and validity of, *ad hoc* moments but rests identification on the ability of the constrained simulated score to mimic the behavior of its counterpart based on the observed data.

Note that both Assumption **A5'(i)** and Assumption **A5'(ii)** are more involved than Assumption **A5**, precisely because we do not maintain the null hypothesis that the restrictions  $g(\theta^0) = 0$  are fulfilled. In this setting, re-centering the score by  $\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)/\partial \beta$  (or by a rescaled version of it) is actually needed for consistency. This stands in contrast to the analysis in Section three, which was carried out under the null, where the centering was critical only for asymptotic normality and was immaterial for consistency, since  $\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)/\partial \beta = O_P(1/\sqrt{T})$  under the null.

The immediate validity of Assumption **A5'(i)** is actually warranted in exponential models, as confirmed by the following result.

**Proposition 4:** Assume the parametric model is an exponential family (with i.i.d. observations  $\{y_t\}_{t=1}^T$ ):

$$\log(p(y_t|\theta)) = c(\theta) + h(y_t) + \sum_{k=1}^K A_k(\theta) T_k(y_t)$$

with, for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ , the same support  $\mathcal{Y}$  for the probability distribution with density function  $p(\cdot|\theta)$ . Assume that the components of the sufficient statistics  $T(y) = [T_k(y)]_{1 \leq k \leq K}$  are linearly independent in the affine sense:

$$\left[ \exists \lambda_0, \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}, \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k T_k(y) = \lambda_0 \right] \implies \lambda_k = 0, \forall k = 1, \dots, K$$

Then, if the matrix

$$\frac{\partial A(\theta)}{\partial \theta'} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta'} \begin{bmatrix} A_1(\theta) \\ \vdots \\ A_K(\theta) \end{bmatrix}$$

is full column rank for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ , the matrix  $\frac{\partial L(\theta, \beta^0)}{\partial \theta'}$  is non-singular for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ .  $\square$

To understand the content of Proposition 4, several remarks are in order.

- (i) It is obvious from the proof provided in the appendix that the assumption of i.i.d. data is only for the sake of notational simplicity. A dynamic exponential model would not be more complicated to handle to obtain the same conclusion.
- (ii) It is well known (see, e.g., Gourieroux and Monfort (1995) Property 3.11. page 92), that the above exponential model is identified if and only if the mapping  $\theta \mapsto A(\theta)$  is injective. It is then quite natural to assume that  $\partial A(\theta)/\partial \theta'$  is full column rank for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . This means that identification is obtained by local first-order identification in the neighborhood of any point  $\theta \in \Theta$ .
- (iii) Assumption **A5'(i)** is then warranted from the conditions of **Proposition 4**, at least locally in the neighborhood of any point  $\theta \in \Theta$ .
- (iv) Assumption **A5'(ii)** is equivalent to Assumption **A5'(i)** in the particular case of an exponential model in the natural form since:

$$[A_k(\theta) = \theta_k, \forall k = 1, \dots, K = d_\theta] \implies \mathcal{J}(\theta, \beta^0) = \frac{\partial^2 c(\beta^0)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} = \mathcal{J}^0$$

Note that the conclusion of Proposition 4 is nothing but the statement of Assumption **A6** in Section three. Jointly with the new identification condition in Assumption **A5**, this conclusion allows us to obtain a result similar to Theorem 2.

**Theorem 5:** If Assumptions **A1'**, **A2'**, **A3**, **A4** and **A6** are satisfied, then

- (i) If Assumption **A5'(i)** is satisfied

$$\sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\theta}_T^{CFS} - \theta^0 \right) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N} \left[ 0, (1 + H^{-1}) \Omega^* \right],$$

with

$$\Omega^* = \left( \frac{\partial L(\beta^0, \theta^0)'}{\partial \theta} [\mathcal{I}^0]^{-1} \frac{\partial L(\beta^0, \theta^0)}{\partial \theta'} \right)^{-1}$$

- (ii) If Assumption **A5'(ii)** is satisfied

$$\sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\theta}_T^s - \theta^0 \right) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N} \left[ 0, (1 + H^{-1}) \Omega^* \right],$$

- (iii) If both Assumption **A5'(i)** and Assumption **A5'(ii)** are satisfied,  $\hat{\theta}_T^{CFS}$  and  $\hat{\theta}_T^s$  are asymptotically equivalent.  $\square$

Note that, in contrast to Theorem 2, there is no alternative interpretation of the asymptotic variance in terms of a binding function  $b(\cdot)$ . When the auxiliary parameters are constrained by  $g(\beta) = 0$ , for instance  $\beta_2 = \bar{\beta}_2$ , there is no such thing as a one-to-one binding function  $\beta = b(\theta)$ . However, this does not imply that I-I can be performed without resorting to some form of a binding function. We simply mean that the correct binding function is

$$\gamma(\theta) = L(\theta, \beta^0)$$

estimated by the “intermediate or auxiliary statistic”

$$\hat{\gamma}_T = \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta}$$

and, similarly for the simulated paths

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{TH}(\theta) = \frac{\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta}$$

The asymptotic variance of the optimal I-I estimator given by Theorems 2 and 5 is nothing but the asymptotic variance computed according to Proposition 4 of GMR, or more precisely, an extension thereof. Directly applying Proposition 4 of GMR would actually lead to the following asymptotic variance formula for the I-I estimator:

$$\left\{ \frac{\partial \gamma'(\theta^0)}{\partial \theta} [\text{Avar}(\hat{\gamma}_T)]^{-1} \frac{\partial \gamma(\theta^0)}{\partial \theta'} \right\}^{-1}$$

with  $\text{Avar}(\hat{\gamma}_T)$  the asymptotic variance of  $\hat{\gamma}_T$ . However, the formula of GMR cannot be correct in this case as the constrained score  $\hat{\gamma}_T$  has a singular asymptotic variance matrix. For instance, in the case of constraints  $\beta_2 = \bar{\beta}_2$ , for any sample size  $T$ ,

$$\frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta_1} = 0$$

However, it is well-known (see, e.g., Gouriéroux and Monfort, 1995) that the score test statistic for the null hypothesis  $g(\theta) = 0$ , denoted by  $\xi_T$  and given by

$$\xi_T = \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta'} [\mathcal{I}^0]^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} = \hat{\gamma}_T' [\mathcal{I}^0]^{-1} \hat{\gamma}_T, \quad (33)$$

has an asymptotic distribution that is  $\chi^2(q)$  under the null. In other words,  $[\mathcal{I}^0]^{-1}$  is a generalized inverse  $[\text{Avar}(\hat{\gamma}_T)]^-$  of the asymptotic variance of  $\hat{\gamma}_T$ . In other words, the asymptotic variance given by Theorem 2 and 5 is nothing but a generalization of the one given in GMR, which can be read as

$$\left\{ \frac{\partial \gamma'(\theta^0)}{\partial \theta} [\text{Avar}(\hat{\gamma}_T)]^- \frac{\partial \gamma(\theta^0)}{\partial \theta'} \right\}^{-1}$$

We note that a similar generalization has been derived by Penaranda and Sentana (2012) in the case of the asymptotic variance of standard GMM estimators.

The bottom line is that, by eliciting for the purpose of I-I a binding function defined by the score vector, we are likely to be more efficient than if we were to simply add *ad hoc* moment conditions as proposed in Calvet and Czellar (2015).

## 5.2 Testing Validity of Constraints

If the constraints  $g(\theta) = 0$  are satisfied at the true  $\theta^0$ , then the FUNC estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T$  is a  $\sqrt{T}$ -consistent and asymptotically normal estimator of  $\theta^0 = \beta^0$ . However, in this case it is still worthwhile to perform the I-I step for at least two reasons: first, for any finite  $T$ , the unconstrained estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T$  need not lie in the domain of the structural parameters  $\Theta$ , and so for reasons of interpretation the I-I estimator will be preferred; second, as discussed in Gouriéroux et al. (2000), due to the I-I step,  $\hat{\theta}_T^s$  is likely to have better finite sample properties than  $\hat{\beta}_T$  or  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$ .

It is also useful to realize that the score and Hessian used to calculate  $\hat{\beta}_T$  are exactly the components required to carry out a score test of the null hypothesis

$$H_0 : g(\theta) = 0$$

More precisely, by definition

$$\hat{\beta}_T - \hat{\beta}_T^r = - \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta}$$

so that a feasible version of the score test statistic defined in equation (33) can be written as

$$\xi_T = (\hat{\beta}_T - \hat{\beta}_T^r)' \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right] (\hat{\beta}_T - \hat{\beta}_T^r) \quad (34)$$

where we have used the fact that, under the null, we have a well-specified parametric model so that

$$\mathcal{J}^0 = \mathcal{I}^0$$

The standard likelihood theory then applies and allows us to state the following result.

**Corollary 1:** We assume that the function  $g : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ , is twice continuously differentiable with

$$\text{rank} \left( \frac{\partial g(\theta^0)}{\partial \theta'} \right) = q \leq d_\theta$$

Under **Assumptions A1', A2', A3, A4 and A6** and the null hypothesis  $H_0 : g(\theta) = 0$ , we have that  $\xi_T \rightarrow_d \chi_q^2$ .

Two remarks about the above result are in order. First, we have used in equation (34) our FUNC estimator instead of the general unconstrained maximum likelihood estimator. However, since in this section we do not address the case of inequality constraints, the genuine MLE may also be used. Second, from Corollary 1, one can immediately deduce a test to check whether the auxiliary model and the structural model coincide at the true unknown value because  $g(\theta^0) = 0$ . However, our null hypothesis of interest does not state that the auxiliary and structural models coincide for any possible value of the parameters. In other words, under the null we have  $\beta^0 = \theta^0$  but we do not state that  $b(\theta) = \theta$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . In contrast, GMR (see their Section 4.2) propose a test of the latter assumption (with power at least in a neighborhood of the true value) by comparing directly auxiliary estimators  $\hat{\beta}_T$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}(\hat{\beta}_T)$ .

### 5.3 An Illustrative Example: Dynamic Probit

To illustrate the usefulness of the above I-I approach, let us return to the dynamic probit model. We observe  $\{y_t, x_t\}_{t=1}^T$  from

$$y_t = \begin{cases} 1 & : y_t^* > 0 \\ 0 & : y_t^* \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

$$y_t^* = x_t' \theta_1 + u_t, \quad u_t = \theta_2 u_{t-1} + \nu_t,$$

where  $x_t$  is a vector of explanatory variables,  $\nu_t \sim_{iid} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  and  $-1 < \theta_2 < 1$ . In what follows, panel data can easily be accommodated at the cost of more involved notations, and so we omit this extension for simplicity.

Unlike the standard probit model, the autoregressive nature of  $u_t$  means that the data density can only be stated as a  $T$ -dimensional integral

$$p(y_T | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}; \theta_1, \theta_2) = \int_{y_1 \geq 0} \cdots \int_{y_T \geq 0} p(y_T^* | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}^*; \theta_1, \theta_2) dy_1^* \cdots dy_T^*,$$

$$p(y_T^* | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}^*; \theta_1, \theta_2) \propto Q^{-T/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2Q} u_1^2(\theta_1)\right) \prod_{t=2}^T \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(u_t(\theta_1) - \theta_2 u_{t-1}(\theta_1)) Q^{-1} (u_t(\theta_1) - \theta_2 u_{t-1}(\theta_1))\right)$$

where  $\geq$  means  $y_t^* > 0$  if  $y_t = 1$  and  $y_t^* < 0$  if  $y_t = 0$ ,  $Q = (1 - \rho^2)$  and  $u_t(\theta_1) = y_t^* - x_t' \theta_1$ .

Note that taking  $\theta_2 = 0$  in  $p(y_T^* | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}^*; \theta_1, \theta_2)$  yields the usual probit density. In this way, we can take as our auxiliary model for I-I the structural model where we impose the constraint of no serial dependence. The restricted auxiliary parameter estimate is then given as the solution to the first-order conditions of the Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_T(\beta_1, \beta_2) = Q_T(\beta_1, \beta_2) + \beta_2 \lambda$ , where  $Q_T(\beta_1, \beta_2) = \log(p(y_T | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}; \beta_1, \beta_2))$ . Denote this solution by  $\hat{\beta}_T^r = (\hat{\beta}_{1,T}^r, 0)'$ , with  $\hat{\beta}_{1,T}^r$  the standard probit estimator.

$\hat{\beta}_T^r$  will be inconsistent for  $\theta^0$  unless  $\theta_2^0 = 0$ . Therefore, consistency of our I-I approach will rest on the use of  $\hat{\beta}_T$ , which requires calculating, either numerically or analytically,

$$\left. \frac{\partial Q_T(\beta_1, \beta_2)}{\partial \beta} \right|_{\beta = \hat{\beta}_T^r}, \quad \left. \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\beta_1, \beta_2)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right|_{\beta = \hat{\beta}_T^r},$$

and which themselves depend on the particular structure of  $p(y_T | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}; \beta_1, \beta_2)$ . Even though  $p(y_T | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}; \beta_1, \beta_2)$  may be too computationally intensive to directly optimize, the derivatives of  $Q_T(\beta_1, \beta_2) = \log(p(y_T | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}; \beta_1, \beta_2))$  are available in closed form under the constraint  $\beta_2 = 0$ .

In this dynamic probit example, the results of Gourieroux et al. (1985) yield the following closed-form expressions for  $\partial Q_T(\beta_1, 0) / \partial \beta$ :

$$\left. \frac{\partial Q_T(\beta_1, \beta_2)}{\partial \beta} \right|_{\beta_2=0} = \left( \sum_{t=1}^T x_t' \tilde{u}_t(\beta_1, 0), \sum_{t=2}^T \tilde{u}_{t-1}(\beta_1, 0) \tilde{u}_t(\beta_1, 0) \right)'$$

$$\tilde{u}_t(\beta_1, 0) = \frac{\varphi(x_t' \beta_1)}{\Phi(x_t' \beta_1)(1 - \Phi(x_t' \beta_1))} [y_t - \Phi(x_t' \beta_1)]$$

where  $\tilde{u}_t$  is the generalized residual (see Gourieroux et al., 1987). Noting that  $\partial^2 Q_T(\beta_1, 0) / \partial \beta_1 \partial \beta_1'$  is the standard probit Hessian, a closed form expression for  $\partial^2 Q_T(\beta_1, 0) / \partial \beta \partial \beta'$  is obtained by noting that

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\beta_1, \beta_2)}{\partial \beta_2 \partial \beta_2} \right|_{\beta_2=0} = \sum_{t=2}^T \tilde{u}_{t-1}^2(\beta_1, 0)$$

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\beta_1, \beta_2)}{\partial \beta_2 \partial \beta_1'} \right|_{\beta_2=0} = \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_{t-1}(\beta_1, 0)}{\partial \beta_1'} \tilde{u}_t(\beta_1, 0) + \tilde{u}_{t-1}(\beta_1, 0) \frac{\partial \tilde{u}_t(\beta_1, 0)}{\partial \beta_1'}.$$

The closed form formulas for  $\partial Q_T(\beta_1, 0) / \partial \beta$  and  $\partial^2 Q_T(\beta_1, 0) / \partial \beta \partial \beta'$  would allow us to easily carry out I-I estimation of  $\theta$  using  $\hat{\theta}_T^s$ . The reader may wish to note that while the above formulas

are based on the observed data and  $Q_T(\beta)$ , this same structure pertains to the partial derivatives of  $Q_{TH}(\theta, \beta)$  w.r.t.  $\beta$ . In this example, estimation of  $\theta$  via I-I under the constraint  $\beta_2 = 0$  will be computationally simple and most likely deliver estimators close to the efficient bound given our choice of auxiliary model. However, we merely speculate on the asymptotic efficiency of this approach as any rigorous discussion is beyond the scope of this paper.

Dynamic probit models are most often estimated using simulated maximum likelihood (SML) with either independent or overlapping simulation draws (see, e.g., Gourieroux and Monfort, 1996, for a discussion of SML with independent draws and Armstrong et al., 2016, for discussion with overlapping draws). Regardless of whether draws are independent or overlapping,  $\sqrt{T}$ -consistency of SML requires that the number of simulation draws  $H$  satisfy  $H \rightarrow \infty$  and  $H \gg \sqrt{T}$ . In this way, there is a clear tradeoff between I-I and SML estimation in dynamic probit models.  $\sqrt{T}$ -consistency of I-I only requires a finite number of draws, even  $H = 1$ , and is therefore numerically very simple to implement, whereas  $\sqrt{T}$ -consistency of SML requires  $H \gg \sqrt{T}$  and so will be more computationally costly. However, I-I will generally be inefficient in comparison with SML.

## 6 Constraining an Overidentified Auxiliary Model

### 6.1 General framework

In this section we consider an auxiliary model defined by a vector of restrictions that overidentify the auxiliary parameters  $\beta$  that will be used to conduct I-I on  $\theta^0$ . Auxiliary models of this form could be generated from many different approaches, but are perhaps most simply exemplified by the following two examples.

#### 6.1.1 Asymptotic Least Squares

As a first example, consider an auxiliary model defined by  $q$  restrictions  $g(\beta, \varsigma) = 0$  that overidentify the auxiliary parameters  $\beta \in \mathbf{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\beta}$ , i.e.,  $q > d_\beta$ . In this section, the  $q > d_\beta$  restrictions are non-trivial as they depend on a vector of unknown nuisance parameters  $\varsigma^0$ . While the nuisance parameters  $\varsigma^0$  are unknown, we assume a  $\sqrt{T}$ -consistent estimator  $\hat{\varsigma}_T$  of  $\varsigma^0$  is readily available; i.e.,  $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\varsigma}_T - \varsigma^0) = O_P(1)$ . Furthermore, we assume there exists some unique  $\beta^0 \in \mathbf{B}$  such that

$$g(\beta, \varsigma^0) = 0 \iff \beta = \beta^0$$

Typically, a consistent estimator  $\hat{\beta}_T(A)$  of  $\beta^0$  can be computed by solving the system of equations

$$Ag(\beta, \hat{\varsigma}_T) = 0 \tag{35}$$

for a given matrix  $A$  of dimension  $(d_\beta \times q)$  with rank  $d_\beta$ . Throughout the remainder of this section we will refer to the matrix  $A$  as the selection matrix. Among consistent estimators, it can be shown that one obtains the minimum asymptotic variance  $\text{Avar}(\hat{\beta}_T(A) - \beta^0)$  by choosing the selection matrix to satisfy

$$A = \Gamma'V^{-1} \tag{36}$$

with

$$\Gamma = \frac{\partial g(\beta^0, \varsigma^0)}{\partial \beta'}, \quad V = \frac{\partial g(\beta^0, \varsigma^0)}{\partial \varsigma'} \text{Avar}(\hat{\varsigma}_T) \frac{\partial g'(\beta^0, \varsigma^0)}{\partial \varsigma}$$

and where  $\Gamma$  has rank  $d_\beta$  and  $V$  is non-singular.

Estimating equations of the form (35), with the “optimal” selection matrix  $A$  in (36), correspond to the optimal Asymptotic Least Squares (ALS) estimator (see, e.g., Gourieroux and Monfort, 1995, Chapter 9.1.)

$$\arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{B}} g(\beta, \hat{\varsigma}_T)' V^{-1} g(\beta, \hat{\varsigma}_T)$$

The theory of ALS may pave the way for I-I based on a binding function defined by

$$Ag(\beta, \varsigma(\theta)) = 0 \iff \beta = b_A(\theta)$$

with  $\varsigma(\theta)$  defined as

$$\varsigma(\theta) = \text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\varsigma}_T(\theta)$$

and where  $\tilde{\varsigma}_T(\theta)$  is obtained from simulated data  $\{\tilde{y}_t(\theta)\}_{t=1}^T$ .

The key feature of this example is that there are as many binding functions  $b_A(\theta)$  as possible choices for the selection matrix  $A$ . In particular, it must be realized that while choosing  $A$  as in (36) is optimal for direct estimation of the auxiliary parameters  $\beta$ , it may not be optimal for indirect estimation of  $\theta$ .

For sake of expositional simplicity, we use the exact knowledge of the binding function  $b_A(\theta)$  and only consider Wald-based I-I estimators of  $\theta$  defined as

$$\hat{\theta}_T[A, W] = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \left( \hat{\beta}_T(A) - b_A(\theta) \right)' W \left( \hat{\beta}_T(A) - b_A(\theta) \right) \quad (37)$$

for some positive definite weighting matrix  $W$ . The estimator  $\hat{\theta}_T[A, W]$  is indexed by the selection matrix  $A$ , defining the auxiliary parameter estimates, and the weighting matrix  $W$  to remind the reader that the asymptotic distribution of  $\hat{\theta}_T[A, W]$  critically depends on these choices. It is only when  $\beta$  is just-identified,  $d_\beta = q$ , that the matrix  $A$  is immaterial and the optimal weighting matrix  $W$  is then given in Section three.

Note that, in practice one would only know a consistent estimator  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}(\theta; A)$  of  $b_A(\theta)$  obtained as the solution of the estimating equations

$$Ag(\beta, \tilde{\varsigma}_{TH}(\theta)) = 0$$

with  $\tilde{\varsigma}_{TH}(\theta)$  obtained using a simulated path  $\{\tilde{y}_t(\theta)\}_{t=1}^{TH}$ . In other words, we simplify the notational setting by working as if  $H = \infty$ . Taking  $H$  finite would, as usual, simply lead us to multiply the asymptotic variance of the I-I estimator of  $\theta$  by a factor  $(1 + \frac{1}{H})$ .

### 6.1.2 Generalized Method of Moments

Similar in spirit to the ALS example, Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) is an additional example of auxiliary models that can yield a set of overidentified estimating equations for  $\beta$ . In the GMM case, we take as our auxiliary statistics a vector of  $q > d_\beta$  moment restrictions that overidentify  $\beta \in \mathbb{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\beta}$  and satisfy

$$E[\varphi_t(\beta)] = 0 \iff \beta = \beta^0, \quad (38)$$

where  $\varphi_t(\beta) = \varphi \left[ (y_{t-i})_{0 \leq i \leq p}, \beta \right]$  with  $\varphi[\cdot, \cdot]$  a known function. Now, a consistent estimator  $\widehat{\beta}_T(A)$  of  $\beta$  can be computed by solving the system of  $q$  equations

$$0 = A\bar{\varphi}_T(\beta) = A \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \varphi_t(\beta) \quad (39)$$

where  $A$  is a given selection matrix of dimension  $(d_\beta \times q)$  and rank  $d_\beta$ . Among these consistent estimators, it is well-known that one obtains the minimum asymptotic variance  $\text{Avar} \left( \widehat{\beta}_T(A) - \beta^0 \right)$  for direct estimation of  $\beta^0$  by choosing

$$A = \Gamma' V^{-1}$$

where

$$\Gamma = E \left[ \frac{\partial \varphi_t(\beta^0)}{\partial \beta'} \right], V = \text{Avar} \left( \bar{\varphi}_T(\beta^0) \right)$$

Estimating equations (39) with the “optimal” choice of  $A = \Gamma' V^{-1}$  correspond to the efficient Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) estimator (Hansen, 1982)

$$\arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{B}} \bar{\varphi}_T(\beta)' V^{-1} \bar{\varphi}_T(\beta)$$

Again, with obvious notations, the theory of GMM may pave the way for I-I based on a binding function defined as

$$AE_\theta [\tilde{\varphi}_t(\beta; \theta)] \iff \beta = b_A(\theta) \quad (40)$$

where the above notation signifies that  $\tilde{\varphi}_t(\cdot; \cdot)$  is computed on simulated data  $\{\tilde{y}_t(\theta)\}$ . Note that taking  $H = \infty$  yields the exact value of the population expectation in (40) and allows us to compute the exact value of the binding function  $b_A(\theta)$ .

Given  $\widehat{\beta}_T(A)$  and  $b_A(\theta)$ , a Wald-based I-I estimator  $\widehat{\theta}_T[A, W]$  of  $\theta^0$  can again be defined as in (37). When  $q > d_\beta$  the asymptotic distribution of the I-I estimator critically depends on the choice of selection matrix  $A$ .

## 6.2 Efficient Indirect Estimation

In this section we explore, in a unified manner, the optimal choice of the selection matrix  $A$  for I-I estimation of  $\theta$  in the case where the auxiliary model is defined in an ALS or GMM setting. In these situations, we demonstrate that the optimal  $A$  for direct estimation of  $\beta$  does not generally coincide with the optimal  $A$  for I-I estimation of  $\theta$ .

For any given choice of the section matrix  $A$ , the optimal choice of the weighting matrix  $W$  in (37) is obviously, as in GMR,

$$W^*(A) = \left[ \text{Avar} \left( \widehat{\beta}_T(A) - \beta^0 \right) \right]^{-1}$$

A naive choice of the selection matrix  $A$  would then be to elicit the most efficient estimator of  $\beta^0$  by choosing, as explained above, in both the ALS and GMM examples

$$A = \Gamma' V^{-1} \quad (41)$$

However, it must be kept in mind that our focus of interest is not efficient estimation of  $\beta^0$  but efficient estimation of  $\theta^0$ . In this respect, choosing  $A$  to yield the “optimal” value of  $\text{Avar}(\hat{\beta}_T(A) - \beta^0)$  may not minimize  $\text{Avar}(\hat{\theta}_T[A, W^*(A)] - \theta^0)$ . To see this, first note that in both the ALS and GMM examples

$$\text{Avar}(\hat{\beta}_T(A) - \beta^0) = [A\Gamma]^{-1} A V A' [\Gamma' A']^{-1} \quad (42)$$

where the invertibility of the matrix  $A\Gamma$  is implied by the fact that both  $A$  and  $\Gamma$  are  $(d_\beta \times q)$  matrices with rank  $d_\beta$ . Equation (42) is easily obtained by a standard asymptotic Taylor expansion of estimating equations (35) and (39). The reason why the naive choice of the selection matrix  $A = \Gamma' V^{-1}$  in (41) may not be optimal for the I-I estimator  $\hat{\theta}_T[A, W^*(A)]$  of  $\theta^0$  is that the asymptotic variance of the latter depends not only on the asymptotic variance  $\text{Avar}(\hat{\beta}_T(A) - \beta^0)$  of the auxiliary parameters but also on the slope of the binding function in a neighborhood of the true value:

$$\frac{\partial b_A(\theta^0)}{\partial \theta'} = -[A\Gamma]^{-1} A \Gamma_\theta$$

with

$$\Gamma_\theta = \frac{\partial g(\beta^0, \varsigma^0)}{\partial \varsigma'} \frac{\partial \varsigma(\theta^0)}{\partial \theta'}$$

in the ALS example and

$$\Gamma_\theta = E \left[ \frac{\partial \tilde{\varphi}_t(\beta^0; \theta^0)}{\partial \theta'} \right]$$

in the GMM example. These formulas are obvious applications of the implicit function theorem. We are then easily able to deduce the following results.

**Theorem 6:** Under suitable regularity conditions we have the following results.

(i) The asymptotic variance  $\text{Avar}(\hat{\theta}_T[A, W^*(A)] - \theta^0)$  of the I-I estimator is the inverse of

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial b'_A(\theta^0)}{\partial \theta} \left[ \text{Avar}(\hat{\beta}_T(A) - \beta^0) \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial b_A(\theta^0)}{\partial \theta'} &= \Gamma'_\theta A' (A V A')^{-1} A \Gamma_\theta \\ &= (V^{-1/2} \Gamma_\theta)' P_X (V^{-1/2} \Gamma_\theta) \end{aligned}$$

with  $P_X = X(X'X)^{-1}X'$  and  $X = V^{1/2}A'$

(ii) The asymptotic variance  $\text{Avar}(\hat{\theta}_T[A, W^*(A)] - \theta^0)$  achieves its minimum when the columns of  $V^{-1/2}\Gamma_\theta$  are linear combinations of the columns of  $X$ . This is the case for a choice of  $A$  of the form

$$A^* = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma'_\theta V^{-1} \\ \vdots \\ C' \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $C$  is a arbitrary matrix of dimension  $q \times (d_\beta - d_\theta)$ , with rank  $(d_\beta - d_\theta)$ , and whose columns do not belong to the space spanned by the columns of  $V^{-1}\Gamma_\theta$ . This minimum asymptotic variance is given by

$$\text{Avar}(\hat{\theta}_T[A^*, W^*(A^*)] - \theta^0) = [\Gamma'_\theta V^{-1} \Gamma_\theta]^{-1} \quad (43)$$

□

As expected, the optimal choice of the matrix  $A$  for indirect estimation of  $\theta$  given in Theorem 6 does not coincide with the choice  $A = \Gamma'V^{-1}$  that is optimal for direct estimation of  $\beta$ . When  $\theta$  is just identified by  $\beta$  ( $d_\beta = d_\theta$ ), the optimal choice  $A^* = \Gamma'_\theta V^{-1}$  coincides with the optimal choice of  $A$  for direct estimation of  $\theta$ , where we treat the vector of auxiliary parameters  $\beta^0$  as if they were known. In the general case ( $d_\beta \geq d_\theta$ ), one must complete this selection matrix by a matrix  $C$  of dimension  $q \times (d_\beta - d_\theta)$ .

In line with the above comment, equation (43) demonstrates that we do not pay a price for ignoring the value of  $\beta^0$  in terms of optimal I-I estimation of  $\theta$ . The intuition is the following: We can estimate  $\beta^0$  through additional estimating equations  $\beta - b(\theta) = 0$  that just identify  $\beta$  when  $b(\theta)$  is known, which is the case for an infinite number of simulations. This result echoes the following well-known result in GMM estimation theory (see, e.g., Breusch et al., 1999): When additional moment restrictions just identify the additional nuisance parameters that they introduce, they do not modify the accuracy of the efficient GMM estimator of the parameters of interest.

We note that the result of Theorem 6 is conformable to the general philosophy put forward in this paper. Even though we have at our disposal some restrictions bringing more information about the auxiliary parameters  $\beta$ , this information is possibly irrelevant in regards to indirect estimation of  $\theta$ . On the contrary, using these overidentifying restrictions for the purpose of accurate direct estimation of  $\beta$  may adversely affect the accuracy of the indirect estimator of  $\theta$ .

As we alluded to in the introduction, what really matters for I-I estimation is the choice of binding function. To this end, the conflict between direct estimation of  $\beta$  and indirect estimation of  $\theta$  highlighted in Theorem 6 comes about because the additional information brought by the overidentifying restrictions is only about the specific point  $(\beta^0, \theta^0)$  and not about the complete binding function.

To better understand this issue, imagine instead that the overidentifying information pertains to the complete path of the binding function, meaning that, in the ALS example,

$$g(b(\theta), \varsigma(\theta)) = 0, \forall \theta \in \Theta \quad (44)$$

or, in the GMM example,

$$E_\theta[\tilde{\varphi}_t(b(\theta); \theta)] = 0, \forall \theta \in \Theta \quad (45)$$

In other words, the binding function  $\theta \mapsto b(\theta)$  does not depend on a specific selection matrix  $A$ , and thus there is no conflict between efficient estimation of  $\beta$  and efficient estimation of  $\theta$ . We can actually check this directly from the results of Theorem 6, since differentiating the identities (44) or (45) yields

$$\Gamma_\theta + \Gamma \frac{\partial b(\theta^0)}{\partial \theta'} = 0$$

Therefore, the columns of  $\Gamma_\theta$  are linear combinations of the columns of  $\Gamma$ . As a consequence, we obtain

$$P_X(V^{-1/2}\Gamma_\theta) = V^{-1/2}\Gamma_\theta$$

when  $X = V^{1/2}A'$  and with  $A$  chosen for optimal estimation of  $\beta$  ( $A' = V^{-1}\Gamma$ ).

However, it may be argued that an identity like (44) or (45) should be the exception rather than the rule. For instance, Sargan (1983) and Dovonon and Renault (2013) have stressed that for non-linear GMM,  $\beta$  may be globally identified by (38) while first-order identification may fail

at some particular value  $\beta^0$  because the matrix  $\Gamma$  is not full column rank. It turns out that in many circumstances (see, e.g., Dovonon and Renault, 2013) the particular value at which rank deficiency occurs is precisely the case of interest. Dovonon and Hall (2016) have documented the implication of such a lack of first-order identification for I-I when using the naive selection matrix  $A = \Gamma'V^{-1}$ .

Recall that the message of our Theorem 6 is two-fold: one, the naive selection matrix  $A = \Gamma'V^{-1}$  may not be an efficient choice; two, even more importantly, the efficient choice is based on a matrix  $\Gamma_\theta$ , the rank of which has no reason to be deficient when there is a rank deficiency in the matrix  $\Gamma$ . Therefore, it may well be the case that standard asymptotic theory for I-I is still valid, in contrast with the case of Dovonon and Hall (2016), when I-I is performed efficiently.

A similar argument applies in the case of weak identification (see, e.g., Stock and Wright, 2000 and Kleibergen, 2005), that is, when the matrix  $\Gamma$  is only asymptotically rank deficient. A general theory of I-I in the case of first-order under-identification or weak identification of the auxiliary parameters is left for future research.

## 7 Conclusion

The overall message of this paper can be summarized as follows: Application of the I-I methodology may require the imposition of certain constraints on the auxiliary parameters, however, one must bear in mind that the efficiency of I-I estimators for the structural parameters can be adversely affected by the constraints placed on the auxiliary parameters. This paper has studied, in detail, three different situations where this issue can arise and has proposed efficient estimation strategies in each case.

The first situation concerns the case where the auxiliary parameters cannot be defined without some strict inequality constraints that may be binding, in the sense that the true unknown value of the auxiliary parameters is near the boundary of the parameter space. Our proposed strategy is then to use for the purpose of I-I, a FUNC (Feasible UNConstrained) estimator of the auxiliary parameters, which, in spite of being unconstrained, is always well-defined.

In the second situation, we analyze examples where the auxiliary model is defined through possibly misspecified constraints on the structural parameters. We show that, in spite of the appearance to the contrary, the auxiliary model is still able to fully identify the structural parameters. Therefore, this approach to I-I does not require the specification of additional *ad hoc* moments whose purpose is to complete the identification of the structural parameters, as considered elsewhere in the I-I literature.

The third context concerns situations where, possibly due to some interpretation of the auxiliary parameters (as is often the case in the score generators put forward by GT), one would imagine that there exist more restrictions than are needed to identify the auxiliary parameters. In this context, we demonstrate that efficient indirect estimators of the structural parameters should not use the overidentifying restrictions for  $\beta$  to optimize the accuracy of the direct estimator used for  $\beta$ , but use these restrictions to optimize the accuracy of the indirect estimator of  $\theta$ , which is generally not equivalent.

More generally this paper contributes to the search for efficiency in the context of I-I. We emphasize the fact that the moments to match, or equivalently, the score generator provided by the auxiliary model, should not be treated as a statistical object whose inference must be efficient within the logic of the auxiliary world. Instead, auxiliary models should only be used

as lenses focused on minimizing the asymptotic variance of the indirect estimators obtained by calibrating these moments.

## References

- [1] Andrews, Donald W.K. “Estimation when a parameter is on a boundary.” *Econometrica* 67, no. 6 (1999): 1341-1383.
- [2] Andrews, Donald W.K. “Generalized method of moments estimation when a parameter is on a boundary.” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 20, no. 4 (2002): 530-544.
- [3] Armstrong, Tim, A. Ronald Gallant, Han Hong, and Huiyu Li. “The asymptotic distribution of estimators with overlapping simulation draws.” Unpublished Paper. (2016)
- [4] Bansal, Ravi, and Amir Yaron. “Risks for the long run: A potential resolution of asset pricing puzzles.” *The Journal of Finance* 59, no. 4 (2004): 1481-1509.
- [5] Breusch, Trevor, Hailong Qian, Peter Schmidt, and Donald Wyhowski. “Redundancy of moment conditions.” *Journal of Econometrics* 91, no. 1 (1999): 89-111.
- [6] Calvet, Laurent E., and Veronika Czellar. “Through the looking glass: Indirect inference via simple equilibria.” *Journal of Econometrics* 185, no. 2 (2015): 343-358.
- [7] Calzolari, Giorgio, Gabriele Fiorentini, and Enrique Sentana. “Constrained indirect estimation.” *The Review of Economic Studies* 71, no. 4 (2004): 945-973.
- [8] Dovonon, Prosper, and Alastair R. Hall. “The asymptotic properties of GMM and indirect inference under second-order identification.” Unpublished Paper. (2016).
- [9] Dovonon, Prosper, and Eric Renault. “Testing for common conditionally heteroskedastic factors.” *Econometrica* 81, no. 6 (2013): 2561-2586.
- [10] Efron, Bradley, and David V. Hinkley. “Assessing the accuracy of the maximum likelihood estimator: Observed versus expected Fisher information.” *Biometrika* 65, no. 3 (1978): 457-483.
- [11] Engle, Robert F., and Gary G.J. Lee. “Estimating diffusion models of stochastic volatility,” in *Modeling Stock Market Volatility: Bridging the Gap to Continuous Time*. (Edited by Rossi P. E). Academic Press. (1996).
- [12] Frazier, David T., and Eric Renault. “Efficient two-step estimation via targeting.” *Forthcoming: Journal of Econometrics*, (2016).
- [13] Penaranda, Francisco, and Enrique Sentana. “Spanning tests in return and stochastic discount factor mean-variance frontiers: A unifying approach.” *Journal of Econometrics* 170, no. 2 (2012): 303-324.
- [14] Gallant, A. Ronald. and George Tauchen. “Which moments to match.” *Econometric Theory* 12, (1996): 657-681.

- [15] Ghysels, Eric, Andrew C. Harvey, and Eric Renault. "Stochastic volatility." *Handbook of Statistics* 14, (1996): 119-191.
- [16] Gouriéroux, Christian, and Alain Monfort. *Statistics and Econometric Models*. Vol. 1.,2. Cambridge University Press, (1995).
- [17] Gouriéroux, Christian and Alain Monfort. *Simulation-based Econometric Methods*, OUP, (1996).
- [18] Gouriéroux, Christian, Alain Monfort and Eric Renault. "Indirect inference." *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 85, (1993): S85–S118.
- [19] Gouriéroux, Christian, Alain Monfort, Eric Renault, and Alain Trognon. "Generalised residuals." *Journal of Econometrics* 34, no. 1 (1987): 5-32.
- [20] Gouriéroux, Christian, Alain Monfort, and Alain Trognon. "A general approach to serial correlation." *Econometric Theory* 1, no. 3 (1985): 315-340.
- [21] Gouriéroux, Christian, Alain Monfort, and Alain Trognon. "Moindres carré asymptotiques." In *Annales de l'INSEE*. Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques, (1985): 91-122.
- [22] Gouriéroux, Christian, Eric Renault, and Nizar Touzi. "Calibration by simulation for small sample bias correction", in *Simulation-based Inference in Econometrics, Methods and Applications*, edited by R. Mariano, T. Schuermann and M. Weeks, CUP, (1999): 328-358.
- [23] Hansen, Lars Peter. "Large sample properties of generalized method of moments estimators." *Econometrica*, (1982): 1029-1054.
- [24] Hansen, Lars Peter, John Heaton, and Amir Yaron. "Finite-sample properties of some alternative GMM estimators." *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 14, no. 3 (1996): 262-280.
- [25] Jacquier, Eric, Nicholas G. Polson, and Peter E. Rossi. "Bayesian analysis of stochastic volatility models (with discussion)." *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 12, (1994): 371-417.
- [26] Jiang, Wenxin, and Bruce Turnbull. "The indirect method: inference based on intermediate statistics- a synthesis and examples." *Statistical Science* 19, no. 2 (2004): 239-263.
- [27] Ketz, Philipp. "Subvector inference when the true parameter vector is near the boundary." Unpublished Paper. (2016).
- [28] Kim, Sangjoon, Neil Shephard, and Siddhartha Chib. "Stochastic volatility: likelihood inference and comparison with ARCH models." *The Review of Economic Studies* 65, no. 3 (1998): 361-393.
- [29] Kleibergen, Frank. "Testing parameters in GMM without assuming that they are identified." *Econometrica* 73, no. 4 (2005): 1103-1123.

- [30] Monfardini, Chiara. “Estimating stochastic volatility models through indirect inference.” *The Econometrics Journal* 1, no. 1 (1998): 113-128.
- [31] Pastorello, Sergio, Eric Renault, and Nizar Touzi. “Statistical inference for random-variance option pricing.” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 18, no. 3 (2000): 358-367.
- [32] Pinkse, Joris, and Margaret E. Slade. “Contracting in space: An application of spatial statistics to discrete-choice models.” *Journal of Econometrics* 85, no. 1 (1998): 125-154.
- [33] Poirier, Dale J., and Paul A. Ruud. “Probit with dependent observations.” *The Review of Economic Studies* 55, no. 4 (1988): 593-614.
- [34] Robinson, Peter M. “On the asymptotic properties of estimators of models containing limited dependent variables.” *Econometrica*, (1982): 27-41.
- [35] Sargan, Dennis J. “Identification and lack of identification.” *Econometrica*, (1983): 1605-1633.
- [36] Stock, James H., and Jonathan H. Wright. “GMM with weak identification.” *Econometrica* 68, no. 5 (2000): 1055-1096.

## A Proofs of Main Results

### A.1 Proof of Proposition 1:

We actually prove a more detailed result, stated as Lemma 1 below, for which Proposition 1 is a direct corollary. The lemma is worth considering for its own sake, in particular for a more comprehensive grasp on the asymptotic theory of constrained estimation that operates in the background.

Let us denote by  $C_T$  the random subset of indices  $j = 1, \dots, q$  for which the constraints are binding

$$\begin{aligned} g_j(\hat{\beta}_T^r) &= a_{j,T}, \forall j \in C_T \\ g_j(\hat{\beta}_T^r) &> a_{j,T}, \forall j \notin C_T \end{aligned}$$

where, for each  $j = 1, \dots, q$ , we have  $a_{j,T} = o(1)$ .

With  $c_T$  denoting the number of elements of  $C_T$ , let us define, in the case where  $c_T > 0$ , the following vectors and matrices whose dimensions are sample dependent (through  $c_T$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}_T(\beta_T^0) &= (g_j(\beta_T^0) - a_{j,T})_{j \in C_T}, \quad \tilde{\lambda}_T = (\hat{\lambda}_{j,T})_{j \in C_T} \\ X_T &= J_T^{-1/2} \frac{\partial \tilde{g}_T'(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} \end{aligned}$$

Note that, when one computes a constrained estimator subject only to equality constraints, there is no such thing as random dimensions:  $\tilde{g}_T(\cdot)$  is identical to  $g(\cdot)$ ,  $X_T$  is always a  $d_\beta \times q$  matrix and  $\tilde{\lambda}_T \equiv \hat{\lambda}_T$  is computed without any sign restriction or slackness condition.

We now present have the following result.

**Lemma 1:** With the notations

$$Y_T = J_T^{1/2} \sqrt{T} \left( \ddot{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0 \right), Y_T^r = J_T^{1/2} \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0 \right)$$

when  $c_T > 0$  (at least one binding constraint)

$$\begin{aligned} Y_T^r &= M_{X_T} Y_T - X_T (X_T' X_T)^{-1} \sqrt{T} \tilde{g}_T(\beta_T^0) + o_P(1) \\ X_T \sqrt{T} \tilde{\lambda}_T &= -P_{X_T} Y_T - X_T (X_T' X_T)^{-1} \sqrt{T} \tilde{g}_T(\beta_T^0) + o_P(1) \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where

$$P_{X_T} = X_T [X_T' X_T]^{-1} X_T', M_{X_T} = Id_{d_\beta} - P_{X_T}$$

If no constraint is binding

$$Y_T^r = Y_T, \hat{\lambda}_T = 0$$

Moreover, the two error terms  $o_P(1)$  of equations (46) are identically zero when the criterion function  $Q_T(\beta)$  is quadratic and the constraints  $g(\beta)$  are linear  $\square$ .

Before proving Lemma 1, let us first show why Proposition 1 is a direct corollary. When  $c_T > 0$ , since  $P_{X_T} + M_{X_T} = Id_{d_\beta}$ , we have

$$Y_T^r - X_T \sqrt{T} \tilde{\lambda}_T = Y_T + o_P(1)$$

that is (after left multiplication by  $J_T^{1/2}$ )

$$J_T \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0 \right) - \frac{\partial \tilde{g}_T'(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} \sqrt{T} \tilde{\lambda}_T = J_T \sqrt{T} \left( \ddot{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0 \right) + o_P(1)$$

Note that, by virtue of the slackness restrictions, this can be rewritten as

$$J_T \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0 \right) - \frac{\partial g'(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} \sqrt{T} \hat{\lambda}_T = J_T \sqrt{T} \left( \ddot{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0 \right) + o_P(1) \quad (47)$$

Equation (47) remains valid when no constraint is binding ( $\hat{\lambda}_T = 0$ ). Moreover, the remainder term  $o_P(1)$  in (47) is obviously zero when the two remainder terms in (46) are both zero. Hence, the proof of Proposition 1 follows directly from Lemma 1.

**Proof of Lemma 1:** The result is obvious when no constraint is binding: unconstrained and constrained estimators coincide and the vector  $\hat{\lambda}_T$  of KT multipliers is zero by virtue of the slackness restrictions.

When  $c_T > 0$ , a first-order expansions of conditions (7) that define the constrained estimator give

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta'} + \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0 \right) + \frac{\partial g'(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} \sqrt{T} \hat{\lambda}_T &= o_P(1) \\ \sqrt{T} \tilde{g}_T(\beta_T^0) + \frac{\partial \tilde{g}_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta'} \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0 \right) &= o_P(1) \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Two remarks are in order about the error terms  $o_P(1)$  left in the two above equations. The first one is identically zero when the objective function is quadratic while the second one is zero when constraints are linear.

More generally, using the definition of the infeasible unconstrained estimator  $\ddot{\beta}_T$ , we can, by applying again the slackness restrictions, rewrite the first equation as follows

$$J_T \sqrt{T} \left( \ddot{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0 \right) - J_T \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0 \right) + \frac{\partial \tilde{g}_T'(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} \sqrt{T} \tilde{\lambda}_T = o_P(1)$$

Note (see Subsection 2.4 for a more detailed discussion) that the three terms of the LHS of the above equality are all  $O_P(1)$ , as it can be easily deduced from Andrews (1999) general theory of constrained estimation. Hence,

$$\sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0 \right) = \sqrt{T} \left( \ddot{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0 \right) + J_T^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{g}_T'(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} \sqrt{T} \tilde{\lambda}_T + o_P(1) \quad (49)$$

Plugging this formula into the second equation of (48) (the linearized binding constraints), we obtain

$$\sqrt{T} \tilde{g}_T(\beta_T^0) + \frac{\partial \tilde{g}_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta'} \sqrt{T} \left( \ddot{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0 \right) + \frac{\partial \tilde{g}_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta'} J_T^{-1} \frac{\partial \tilde{g}_T'(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} \sqrt{T} \tilde{\lambda}_T = o_P(1)$$

We note that this equation can be rewritten

$$\sqrt{T} \tilde{g}_T(\beta_T^0) + X_T' Y_T + X_T' X_T \sqrt{T} \tilde{\lambda}_T = o_P(1)$$

Hence,

$$X_T \sqrt{T} \tilde{\lambda}_T = -P_{X_T} Y_T - X_T (X_T' X_T)^{-1} \sqrt{T} \tilde{g}_T(\beta_T^0) + o_P(1)$$

Left-multiplying (49) by  $J_T^{1/2}$ , we deduce, with  $Y_T^r = J_T^{1/2} \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0 \right)$  that

$$Y_T^r = Y_T + X_T \sqrt{T} \tilde{\lambda}_T + o_P(1) = M_{X_T} Y_T - X_T (X_T' X_T)^{-1} \sqrt{T} \tilde{g}_T(\beta_T^0) + o_P(1)$$

■

## A.2 Proof of Theorem 1

By definition

$$\sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T - \hat{\beta}_T^r \right) = 0$$

Therefore, by a Taylor expansion of the first term around the true value  $\beta_T^0$  :

$$\sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \sqrt{T} (\hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0) + \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \sqrt{T} \left( \beta_T^0 - \hat{\beta}_T^r \right) = - \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0 \right) + o_P(1)$$

and then, since  $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta_T^0) = O_P(1)$ , we can obviously simplify the above decomposition to obtain

$$\sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} = - \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0 \right) + o_P(1)$$

Since by Assumption **A1**, we know that

$$\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} = -\mathcal{J}^0$$

we can conclude that  $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0) = O_P(1)$  and

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0) = [\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1} \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta} + o_P(1)$$

By comparison with the definition of  $\ddot{\beta}_T$ :

$$\sqrt{T}(\ddot{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0) = [J_T]^{-1} \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_T(\beta_T^0)}{\partial \beta}$$

we have the announced equivalence between estimators

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0) = \sqrt{T}(\ddot{\beta}_T - \beta_T^0) + o_P(1)$$

■

### A.3 Proof of Proposition 2

(i) We first prove that  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W)$  is consistent. By Assumption **A4(i)**,  $m_{TH}^{CFS}[\theta; \hat{\lambda}_T]$  converges in probability, uniformly on  $\theta \in \Theta$ , towards

$$\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{\partial Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} - \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \right\} = L(\theta, \beta^0) - L(\theta^0, \beta^0) = L(\theta, \beta^0)$$

The identification Assumption **A5**, jointly with compactness of  $\Theta$  and the continuity assumption **A3(ii)** then yields

$$\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W) \right\} = \theta^0$$

(ii) We have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{m}_{TH}[\theta; \hat{\beta}_T] - m_{TH}^{CFS}[\theta; \hat{\lambda}_T] &= \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} (\hat{\beta}_T - \hat{\beta}_T^r) + \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \\ &= -\frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta'} + \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \end{aligned}$$

By **Assumptions A4(ii)**, this difference converges, uniformly on  $\theta \in \Theta$ , towards

$$-\mathcal{J}(\theta, \beta^0)[\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1}L(\theta^0, \beta^0) + L(\theta^0, \beta^0) = 0$$

where  $\mathcal{J}^0 = \mathcal{J}(\theta^0, \beta^0)$ .

Then, by a standard argument (see, e.g., Pakes and Pollard, 1989, page 1038), we deduce that

$$\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_{T,H}^s(W) \right\} = \text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \hat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W) \right\} = \theta^0$$

(iii) By assumption **A4(ii)**, we know that for any sequence  $\{\gamma_T\}$  of positive numbers converging to zero

$$\sup_{\|\theta - \theta^0\| \leq \gamma_T} \left\| -\frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}(\theta, \hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} + \text{Id}_{d_\beta} \right\| = o_P(1),$$

where  $\text{Id}_{d_\beta}$  is the  $(d_\beta \times d_\beta)$  identity matrix. Then, we deduce from the above decomposition that

$$\sup_{\|\theta - \theta^0\| \leq \gamma_T} \left\| \bar{m}_{TH}[\theta; \hat{\beta}_T] - m_{TH}^{CFS}[\theta; \hat{\lambda}_T] \right\| = o_P \left( \left\| \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \right\| \right) = o_P \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \right)$$

which in turn implies that

$$\sup_{\|\theta - \theta^0\| \leq \gamma_T} |S_T^{unr}(\theta) - S_T^{res}(\theta)| = o_P(1/\sqrt{T})$$

for  $S_T^{unr}(\theta)$  and  $S_T^{res}(\theta)$  respectively the objective functions minimized in (17) and (19) to define the estimators  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^s(W)$  and  $\hat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W)$  respectively.

It is then a standard argument (see, e.g., Pakes and Pollard, 1989, page 1040) to deduce that, using the asymptotic normality in Assumption **A1(i)**, the corresponding extremum estimators are asymptotically equivalent.

$$\left\| \hat{\theta}_{T,H}^s(W) - \hat{\theta}_{T,H}^{CFS}(W) \right\| = o_P(1/\sqrt{T})$$

## A.4 Proof of Theorem 3

The result follows from the following sequence of arguments.

- (i)  $\hat{\theta}_T^c$  solves  $\hat{\beta}_T = \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^c(\theta)$
- (ii)  $\hat{\theta}_T^s$  solves  $0 = \bar{m}_{TH}[\theta, \hat{\beta}_T]$
- (iii) From (ii) and the structure of  $\bar{m}_{TH}[\theta, \hat{\beta}_T]$  we have, re-arranging  $0 = \bar{m}_{TH}[\hat{\theta}_T^s, \hat{\beta}_T]$  and solving for  $\hat{\beta}_T$ ,

$$\hat{\beta}_T = \hat{\beta}_T^r - \left[ \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}[\hat{\theta}_T^s, \hat{\beta}_T^r]}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right]^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_{TH}[\hat{\theta}_T^s, \hat{\beta}_T^r]}{\partial \beta} = \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^c(\hat{\theta}_T^s),$$

where the last equality follows from the definition of  $\tilde{\beta}_{TH}^c(\theta)$ . Therefore, from (i) we have  $\hat{\beta}_T = \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^c(\hat{\theta}_T^c)$  and from (iii) we have

$$\hat{\beta}_T = \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^c(\hat{\theta}_T^c) = \tilde{\beta}_{TH}^c(\hat{\theta}_T^s)$$

■

## A.5 Proof of Proposition 4

We have

$$\begin{aligned} L(\theta, \beta^0) &= \frac{\partial c(\beta^0)}{\partial \beta} + \text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\partial A_k(\beta^0)}{\partial \beta} T_k(\tilde{y}_t(\theta)) \\ &= \frac{\partial c(\beta^0)}{\partial \theta} + \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\partial A_k(\beta^0)}{\partial \theta} E[T_k(\tilde{y}_t(\theta))] \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\frac{\partial L(\theta, \beta^0)}{\partial \theta'} = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\partial A_k(\beta^0)}{\partial \beta} \frac{\partial E[T_k(\tilde{y}_t(\theta))]}{\partial \theta'} \quad (50)$$

However,

$$\begin{aligned} E [T_k(\tilde{y}_t(\theta))] &= \int T_k(y)p(y|\theta)dy \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{\partial E [T_k(\tilde{y}_t(\theta))]}{\partial \theta'} = \int T_k(y) \frac{\partial \log(p(y|\theta))}{\partial \theta'} dy = Cov_\theta \left[ T_k(y), \frac{\partial \log(p(y|\theta))}{\partial \theta} \right] \end{aligned}$$

where  $Cov_\theta [h(y), d(y)]$  stands for  $Cov [h(\tilde{y}_t(\theta)), d(\tilde{y}_t(\theta))]$ . Therefore:

$$\frac{\partial E [T_k(\tilde{y}_t(\theta))]}{\partial \theta'} = Cov_\theta \left[ T_k(y), \sum_{h=1}^K \frac{\partial A_h(\theta)}{\partial \theta} T_h(y) \right]$$

Hence,

$$\frac{\partial E [T(\tilde{y}_t(\theta))]}{\partial \theta'} = Var_\theta [T(y)] \frac{\partial A(\theta)}{\partial \theta'}$$

Therefore, from (50),

$$\frac{\partial L(\theta, \beta^0)}{\partial \theta'} = \frac{\partial A'(\beta^0)}{\partial \theta} Var_\theta [T(y)] \frac{\partial A(\theta)}{\partial \theta'}$$

Since the matrix  $Var_\theta [T(y)]$  is non-singular (the components of  $T(y)$  are independent in the affine sense) and both matrices  $\frac{\partial A'(\beta^0)}{\partial \theta}$  and  $\frac{\partial A(\theta)}{\partial \theta'}$  are of rank  $d_\theta = d_\beta$ , we conclude that the matrix  $\frac{\partial L(\theta, \beta^0)}{\partial \theta'}$  is non-singular. ■

## A.6 Theorem 5

Note that consistency of  $\hat{\theta}_T^s$  and  $\hat{\theta}_T^{CFS}$  follows from Proposition 3. The remainder of the proof follows similarly to that of Proposition 2, and so we only sketch the proof for parts (i) and (ii) of the result.

By **A1'** and **A2'**, using a first-order Taylor series for  $0 = \sqrt{T} \bar{m}_{TH}[\hat{\theta}_T^s; \hat{\beta}_T]$ , and collect terms of order  $O_P(1/\sqrt{T})$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sqrt{T} \bar{m}_{TH}[\hat{\theta}_T^s; \hat{\beta}_T] = \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_{TH}[\hat{\theta}_T^s; \hat{\beta}_T^r]}{\partial \beta} - \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}[\hat{\theta}_T^s; \hat{\beta}_T^r]}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \left\{ \frac{\partial^2 Q_T[\hat{\beta}_T^r]}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \right\}^{-1} \frac{\partial Q_T(\hat{\beta}_T^r)}{\partial \beta} \\ &= \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_{TH}[\theta^0; \beta^0]}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}[\theta^0; \beta^0]}{\partial \beta \partial \theta'} \sqrt{T} (\hat{\theta}_T^s - \theta^0) + \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}[\theta^0; \beta^0]}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \sqrt{T} (\hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta^0) \\ &\quad - \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}[\theta^0; \beta^0]}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} [\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1} \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_T[\beta^0]}{\partial \beta} - \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}[\theta^0; \beta^0]}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} \sqrt{T} (\hat{\beta}_T^r - \beta^0) + O_P(1/\sqrt{T}). \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying the above yields

$$0 = \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_{TH}[\theta^0; \beta^0]}{\partial \beta} - \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}[\theta^0; \beta^0]}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} [\mathcal{J}^0]^{-1} \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_T[\beta^0]}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial^2 Q_{TH}[\theta^0; \beta^0]}{\partial \beta \partial \theta'} \sqrt{T} (\hat{\theta}_T^s - \theta^0) + o_P(1).$$

By Assumptions **A2'**, **A4**, **A5'** we have

$$0 = \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_{TH}[\theta^0; \beta^0]}{\partial \beta} - \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_T[\beta^0]}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial L[\theta^0, \beta^0]}{\partial \theta'} \sqrt{T} (\hat{\theta}_T^s - \theta^0) + o_P(1).$$

Using arguments that parallel those above, we arrive at the additional expansion

$$0 = \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_{TH}[\theta^0; \beta^0]}{\partial \beta} - \sqrt{T} \frac{\partial Q_T[\beta^0]}{\partial \beta} + \frac{\partial L[\theta^0, \beta^0]}{\partial \theta'} \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\theta}_T^{CFS} - \theta^0 \right) + o_P(1).$$

The results now follows from the stated assumptions and by arguments that parallel those in GMR. ■

## B Tables and Density Plots

### B.1 Tables

Table 1: Binding constraints for auxiliary estimators  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$  and  $\hat{\beta}_T$  in design one:  $\theta^{0,1} = (-.736, .90, .363)'$ . All terms are in percentages. For  $\hat{\beta}_T$ , the values represent the percentage where the FUNC estimator would have caused the constraint to bind or be violated.

|                              | T=500             |                 | T=1000            |                 | T=2000            |                 |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|
|                              | $\hat{\beta}_T^r$ | $\hat{\beta}_T$ | $\hat{\beta}_T^r$ | $\hat{\beta}_T$ | $\hat{\beta}_T^r$ | $\hat{\beta}_T$ |
| $\psi \geq 0$                | 0.00%             | 7.00%           | 0.00%             | 2.80%           | 0.00%             | 0.40%           |
| $\varphi \geq .1 * T^{-.49}$ | 22.00%            | 10.20%          | 14.70%            | 12.00%          | 8.00%             | 7.70%           |
| $\pi \geq 0$                 | 0.00%             | 3.60%           | 0.00%             | 0.40%           | 0.00%             | 0.20%           |
| $\varphi + \pi \leq 1$       | 0.40%             | 7.10%           | 0.10%             | 2.80%           | 0.10%             | 0.40%           |

Table 2: Summary statistics for I-I estimates based on the proposed score approach in design one:  $\theta^{0,1} = (-.736, .90, .363)'$ . Median - Median of the Monte Carlo replications. STD- Monte Carlo standard deviation of the replications. RMSE- root mean squared error of the replications. M. Bias- mean bias of the replications.  $\theta^0 = (-.736, .90, .363)'$ .

| T= 500     |        |        |         | T=1000 |        |         | T=2000 |       |         |
|------------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------|--------|-------|---------|
| $\theta$   | STD    | RMSE   | M. Bias | STD    | RMSE   | M. Bias | STD    | RMSE  | M. Bias |
| $\alpha$   | 0.2808 | 0.2808 | 0.0018  | 0.2016 | 0.2017 | -0.0050 | .1408  | .1408 | .0027   |
| $\delta$   | 0.1299 | 0.1397 | -0.0512 | 0.0905 | 0.0957 | -0.0312 | .0447  | .0462 | -.0116  |
| $\sigma_v$ | 0.1071 | 0.1081 | -0.0146 | 0.0647 | 0.0647 | -0.0001 | .0336  | .0340 | .0050   |

Table 3: Binding constraints for auxiliary estimators  $\hat{\beta}_T^r$  and  $\hat{\beta}_T$  in design two:  $\theta^{0,2} = (-.141, .98, .0614)'$ . All terms are in percentages. For  $\hat{\beta}_T$ , the values represent the percentage where the FUNC estimator would have caused the constraint to bind or be violated.

|                         | T=500             |                 | T=1000            |                 | T=2000            |                 |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|
|                         | $\hat{\beta}_T^r$ | $\hat{\beta}_T$ | $\hat{\beta}_T^r$ | $\hat{\beta}_T$ | $\hat{\beta}_T^r$ | $\hat{\beta}_T$ |
| $\psi \geq 0$           | 0.00%             | 10.40%          | 0.00%             | 5.20%           | 0.00%             | 1.50%           |
| $\varphi \geq T^{-.49}$ | 30.80%            | 15.10%          | 26.90%            | 21.10%          | 19.60%            | 18.20%          |
| $\pi \geq 0$            | 2.20%             | 4.40%           | 1.30%             | 1.90%           | 0.70%             | 1.10%           |
| $\varphi + \pi \leq 1$  | 0.70%             | 10.50%          | 0.40%             | 5.20%           | 0.00%             | 1.50%           |

Table 4: Summary statistics for I-I estimates based on the proposed score approach in design two:  $\theta^{0,2} = (-.141, .98, .0614)'$ . Median - Median of the Monte Carlo replications. STD- Monte Carlo standard deviation of the replications. RMSE- root mean squared error of the replications. M. Bias- mean bias of the replications.  $\theta^0 = (-.141, .98, .0614)'$ .

| T= 500     |        |        |         | T=1000 |        |         | T=2000 |       |         |
|------------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------|--------|-------|---------|
| $\theta$   | STD    | RMSE   | M. Bias | STD    | RMSE   | M. Bias | STD    | RMSE  | M. Bias |
| $\alpha$   | 0.5576 | 0.5576 | 0.0037  | 0.3857 | 0.3860 | -0.0171 | .2822  | .2822 | .0018   |
| $\delta$   | 0.1584 | 0.1799 | -0.0853 | 0.1063 | 0.1137 | -0.0403 | .0405  | .0424 | -.0126  |
| $\sigma_v$ | 0.0892 | 0.0962 | 0.0360  | 0.0489 | 0.0537 | 0.0223  | .0269  | .0311 | .0156   |

## B.2 Monte Carlo Sampling Distributions




Figure 1: Sampling distribution for the I-I estimator of  $\delta$  under Monte Carlo design one:  $\theta^{0,1} = (-.736, .90, .363)'$ .




Figure 2: Sampling distribution for the I-I estimator of  $\sigma_v$  under Monte Carlo design one:  $\theta^{0,1} = (-.736, .90, .363)'$ .




Figure 3: Sampling distribution for the I-I estimator of  $\delta$  under Monte Carlo design two:  $\theta^{0,2} = (-.141, .98, .0614)'$ .




Figure 4: Sampling distribution for the I-I estimator of  $\sigma_v$  under Monte Carlo design two:  $\theta^{0,2} = (-.141, .98, .0614)'$ .